

# THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 5.

NOVEMBER, 1891.

No. 2.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

## WHY ARE SERMONS DULL?

BY THE RIGHT REV. THOMAS M. CLARK, D.D., LL.D., BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT  
EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF RHODE ISLAND.

THE remark so often heard, "*It was as dull as a sermon*," indicates that our pulpit discourses are not always regarded as specially interesting or enlivening. There is no reason, in the nature of things, for a sermon's being dull; on the contrary, the Christian preacher has certain advantages which other classes of public speakers do not possess. He is presumed to deal with matters of the profoundest importance to the hearer; the day appropriated to him is regarded as sacred time, and all other pursuits are suspended to give him an opportunity to be heard; the place in which he speaks is a consecrated spot, and the charms of architecture and music and stately ritual combine to give effect to his words; he is listened to with great outward reverence, and no one ventures to contradict him—not, at least, until the service is over; and yet on every Sunday in the year thousands upon thousands of sermons are preached which are heard—if indeed they are listened to at all—merely from a painful sense of duty.

It is very possible that all these aids and accessories may tend to lower the standard of the pulpit and incline the preacher to regard his sermon as a matter of comparative unimportance. He may think that the religious sense is so quickened by the hallowed associations of the hour, the sanctity of the holy temple, the mellowed prismatic light that streams through the painted windows, the seraphic music and the rich diapason of the organ, the measured tones of prayer, the awful mysteries of the sacrament, as to make the expression of anything that originates with him a matter of inferior moment, and so the sermon is reduced to the minimum, both in its length and its substance. As a general rule, very high ritual and very strong preaching do not readily affiliate.

It is sometimes said that the days of the preacher are numbered. Other agencies have come into being to do the work that was once assigned to the pulpit; new occupations have been found for the Sunday; the multitudinous religious papers and periodicals, supplemented by the daily secular press, are sufficient to keep the public mind informed upon those subjects which were formerly monopolized by the preacher; multitudes of people are glad to escape from the dreary confinement of their stifled habitations and breathe on Sunday the free air of heaven by the open sea, or amid the shady groves—"God's first temples." I was struck by the remark once made to me by the rector of a church in San Francisco, to the effect that it was difficult to secure a good congregation in that city on a pleasant Sunday, while he could rely on an excellent attendance upon a rainy day.

It is impossible for us to comprehend the feeling which stimulated our Puritan ancestors to sit quietly hour after hour, with the thermometer at zero, listening to elaborate metaphysical discourses, which would seem to us as dry and profitless as a table in logarithms; and yet there has never been a period when there was so much to incite the preacher of Christ's Word to do his best in the pulpit as there is now. The popular interest in science and art and literature can never make men oblivious of those matters which pertain to the soul and its destiny. Nothing can ever compete with the high and holy demands of our spiritual nature; and the more we learn of what is going on around us the more intense will be our desire to read the profounder secrets that are working within; the more we know of the past, the more anxious we must be to penetrate the solemn realities of the future. The preacher's work is not yet done, and

he has the comfort of knowing that he deals with men and women who are every day becoming better and better informed respecting the subjects of which he treats—more critical, perhaps, than their progenitors; more sceptical, it may be; more agnostic in their tendencies; but this ought to rouse him to higher effort and make him more careful in the statement of his principles and more scrupulous in the treatment of his facts and arguments. The controversies which distract all our churches to-day, however deplorable they may be in certain aspects, are still signs of life; and it is better for the preacher to deal with those who are disturbed in spirit than with people who passively accept everything that is told them without any action of their own minds. It is better to address the living than the dead. All the discouraging things to which I have referred are more than counterbalanced by the fact that the well-instructed, well-balanced minister of Christ stands upon a firmer foundation than any of his predecessors ever did. The theological discussions of the day are gradually disclosing the weaker points in our lines of defence; while, at the same time, they make manifest the eternal truth, which cannot be confounded. The popular apprehension of God is clearer than it ever was before; and all our ethics and theology are only the unfolding of the root idea of God. It is folly to say that the interest in sermons has gone by. Let a man rise up who has a word to say that comes home to the hearts of men, and there will be no lack of an audience. Witness the fact, how, a year or two ago, the clamors of Wall Street were hushed at noontide day after day, while the tide of speculators and busy men surged into the great church in Broadway to hear a real man speak real things to their souls.

Neither can it be said that there has been a falling off, during the present generation, in the standard of learning and ability among our preachers. It would be strange if it were so, when we consider the great advance that has been made in the style of theological training in all denominations. As a general rule, the professors in our divinity schools are selected from the ranks of those who are most learned in their profession and most apt to teach. They are supposed to represent the living thought of the age, to have a breadth of vision beyond that of ordinary men, to be capable not only of profound thinking themselves, but to have the gift of making others think; and, therefore, we have a right to expect that the men who come forth from their

hands will be competent to discharge their duties with vigor and effectiveness. And yet, for some reason, the number of preachers who are sought after on the ground of their power in the pulpit is comparatively small. Men of abundant learning, clear-headed men, who can talk well and write well in other departments, fail to interest their congregations, and very likely after a time relapse into obscurity. The instances of such failures are innumerable and sad to think upon. Why is it so? Various answers may be given to this question.

The sermons which are preached are not unfrequently altogether unfitted to meet the wants of the congregation. A clergyman who was called to address an assembly of the roughest kind of people in Texas, many of whom had never seen the inside of a church, and possibly had never heard a Gospel sermon, preached to them at some length on the evils incident to the pew system. A learned Western divine recently remarked that he had delivered a course of seventeen sermons on the *Filioque*, and regretted to say that they did not appear to have done any good. A rector on the Hudson River, who had worn out the patience of his flock with doctrinal dissertations in which they had no interest, was requested to give them a course of practical sermons; which he agreed to do, beginning with a discourse on the symbolism of the *Ichthus*. I once heard a sermon on "The Crown of Life," which consisted of an elaborate disquisition on the various styles of head-dress which had been adopted by man and woman-kind; the moral of the discourse being to the effect that the structure worn on the head was more significant than any other article of apparel—the king being known by his crown, the bishop by his mitre, and so on. In a remote country region, where there is not so much as a post-office, or even a shop of any description, a good brother from the city preached on the expediency of opening the public libraries and museums of art on Sunday.

Men of better judgment often fail to secure the attention of their hearers by habitual dwelling upon topics which have no hold upon the people and no relevancy to any real wants of the soul; discussion of dry old dogmas, which the world has long ago ceased to care about; digging up and exposing to view dead heresies, in order to show how horrible they were when they were alive; carefully elaborated treatises of trivial matters of costume and postures and ecclesiastical symbols; minute textual criticisms, with some reference, perhaps, to the

bearings of the Greek particle ; long-winded sketches of Old Testament characters and historical events, which are perfectly familiar to Bible readers, and of very little interest to other people ; speculations and theories and interpretations of the apocalyptic symbols, about which no two scholars agree ; hunting up typical meanings in Hebrew names ; finding the name of God in the Book of Esther, concealed in an ingenious acrostic—such preaching as this must of necessity diffuse a narcotic influence, and make it difficult for the most reverent worshipper to listen with much attention. But let the preacher put all this folly aside and stand up face to face with his people, and make them see that he understands them and knows what are their greatest perils and most urgent spiritual needs, and is in true sympathy with them, and in some degree competent to help them—then there will be no somnolent Christians nodding in their pews, and very few careless old sinners watching the flies as they flit about in the air.

An excellent and highly polished clergyman, in taking charge of a very fashionable church in New York, is said to have defined his position in his introductory sermon by this well-guarded and carefully balanced statement : " You may rest assured, beloved brethren, that so long as I am allowed to stand in this holy place, virtue must be respected and vice discountenanced." This was safe ground to stand upon. Last summer I preached to a Newport congregation on the dangers to which rich and fashionable people are exposed, and the wretchedness and worthlessness of an aimless life ; and I afterward heard that it was said by more than one person that I had shown a lamentable want of tact in preaching on such a subject to such an audience.

The dulness of many preachers is, in a measure, attributable to the fact that their sermons are all constructed upon substantially the same model. Some years ago *Simeon's Skeletons* rattled on the shelves of almost every clerical library, and many a sermon was framed by an attempt to clothe the dry bones with life—to very little purpose. Happily for the world, they are now for the most part buried, as all skeletons should be, unless they are kept for anatomical studies. Something like sixty years ago one of our good professors in the theological seminary that I attended gave me at some length the process by which he constructed a sermon. " After I have selected

my text," he said, " I take my paper, and leaving space enough for the introduction, I insert my first leading head. Allowing a sufficient number of pages for that, I next write out the second leading head, and then in the same way the third, and so on, according to the number of general divisions which I propose to introduce. Then, at proper intervals, I insert the minor divisions of the discourse ; and having done this, I proceed to fill up some one of the intervening spaces ; after which I usually lean back my head and take a sweet nap." As might be expected, the napping was not confined to the *writer* of the sermon.

Many years ago I sat for a while under the ministry of an eminent divine ; and whatever the text might be, five times out of six, the first of his three heads—and this was the invariable number—dealt with " man's fallen state by nature ;" the second with the great doctrine of " justification by faith alone ;" and the third and last head varied somewhat in accordance with the text. The style of the sermon was what some people call " good classical English." Man was always spoken of as " a denizen of earth." Asia was " a foreign strand ;" the broad road was transmuted into " this vast arena, frequented by far the largest numerical majority ;" while the preacher's favorite illustration was the somewhat familiar statement that " the stream cannot rise higher than the fountain."

A sermon is almost certain to be dreary and dull when we do not see the *man* behind it, and there is nothing to make us feel that it is a living being who is addressing the congregation. Lay reading is not popular, even when the discourses read are of the highest order, because we are conscious that the man is not saying anything that comes out of any process of his own mind. A sermon that can be preached just as well by one person as another must be rather a poor sort of thing. In order to the enkindling of real emotion, it is necessary that direct communication should be established between the speaker and the hearer—the flint and steel must come in contact before there can be a spark.

We cannot always tell why we are so unmoved under the preaching of one man, while another, who, perhaps, has nothing like his gifts of eloquence, and not one half as much profound thought, makes the blood tingle and stirs the soul to its depths. We say that one has a peculiar magnetic power of which the other is destitute, whatever this may mean. All that we know about it

is that the charming periods of the former fall upon our ear

"Like snow upon a river—

A moment white, then gone forever :"

while the simpler words of the latter cling to us all through the day, and all through the night, and clarify the soul and fill it with sweetness and light.

There are preachers who impress us with the feeling that they are telling what they have been taught to say, and what they are expected to say; but somehow it leaves no impression; we assent to it, and perhaps admire it, and that is the end of it—it is all very good and very dull.

A certain degree of dulness is to be expected when the preacher feels himself for any reason restrained from the utterance of his real opinions. In such a case, the man is apt to fall out of sight, and an automaton takes his place. The men who move the world always speak from that which is in them, and not from that which comes to them.

It hardly needs to be said that in order to move the age, they must be somewhat in advance of it, and not move with it. One who would interest and influence men must be true to himself, and let the figure of the man be outlined in his words. The preacher who never says a doubtful thing is very likely never to say a true thing—anything which is a genuine reflection of his own soul.

Two preachers may use the same material of doctrine, and from the mouth of one it comes incandescent with light and heat, and from the lips of another it falls like icicles on a frozen ground.

There are men who lift us off our feet not so much by what they say as by their way of saying it; and we surrender ourselves to their power, and the soul vibrates to their touch as the harp to the fingers of the player; and one by one the inner gates of the heart are unlocked, and we begin to see ourselves as we are—all the dark recesses of the soul are laid bare; all the nobler elements of our nature which had been lying dormant are called into action; all the Christlike sympathies, which only needed the touch of Christ's real minister to quicken into life, are aroused, and there is no further effort needed to keep the mind from wandering off into space—we must listen, we cannot help listening.

A sermon that is made to order, and prepared without any reference to the condition of those who are expected to listen to it, must be dull; and the devices to which

some men resort in order to relieve the dulness only tend to aggravate it. There is an artificial earnestness not unfrequently displayed in the pulpit—a thundering and a thrashing altogether out of proportion to the sentiment of the discourse. There is nothing more tedious than the monotony of vociferation; and why there should be so much bellowing in the pulpit it is not easy to tell. I once asked a well-known preacher, after he came down from the pulpit on a warm day, thoroughly exhausted by the physical effort he had been making, what necessity there was for such an amount of gesticulation and noise, and he modestly replied, "I do it in order to conceal the absence of thought;" which, however, he did not quite succeed in doing.

The effectiveness of preaching is often impaired by excessive and unqualified statements, drawing large inferences from very small premises, twisting texts of Scripture in all directions in support of a favorite doctrine, always drawing a sharp line between saints and sinners, as if, at the call of the roll, all the sheep might at once be placed on one side of the aisle and all the goats on the other, leading, perhaps, to unfortunate conclusions on both sides; appealing exclusively to the pains and penalties of the world to come, and neglecting to dwell upon that class of motives which bear upon the formation of character and the destiny of men in the present life; indulging in the same uniform style of exhortation Sunday after Sunday, until it ceases to make any impression; all these things tend to blunt the edge of our preaching.

One secret of the proverbial dulness of sermons is attributable to the fact of their assuming so generally the form of an essay or an oration instead of a direct plea, like that which a lawyer addresses to the jury. There are men who preach *about* the Gospel with considerable skill, but they never really preach the Gospel; they rarely, if ever, make any direct appeal to the people; the sentences are well formed, and express the thought with great propriety, but there is an entire absence of the colloquial element; no talking with the people face to face, no earnest pleading of one soul with another. The preacher stands up in the pulpit to deliver a speech which he has prepared with much care; it is as sound and orthodox as a sermon could possibly be; it shows large and rare reading; it is full of valuable thought; it has some very striking rhetorical embellishments; it is a sermon "fit to preach before a king"—perhaps not before the King of kings; but although it

is adm  
proud o  
is not  
home f  
from h  
practic  
with hi  
no one  
of whic  
finds pa

This  
the gre  
one of  
Declam  
and by  
which  
their p  
was de  
clined  
of as  
quent a

Then  
theolog  
men h  
thing v  
born p  
is doub  
which  
more t  
are ma  
the mi  
for in  
Brook  
ing."

It m  
to a lo  
as a m  
but th  
ness o  
to som  
tain p  
effort  
enunc  
every  
when  
at first  
there  
behin  
soon  
which  
effort  
heart  
foun  
man  
mon  
begin  
whic  
slum  
preac  
with  
neve



is admired, and makes the congregation proud of their minister and wonder that he is not called to a city parish, no one goes home feeling that any load has been taken from his soul, or any doubt relieved, or any practical counsel given that he can carry with him into the details of his busy life; no one goes home with a sting in his heart of which he can never be relieved until he finds pardon and peace at the foot of the cross.

This want of simple directness is one of the greatest faults in our preaching, and one of the main causes of its dullness. Declamation is the curse of the pulpit; and by this I mean that sort of speech which reminds us of school-boys "speaking their piece." If a preacher knew that he was delivering his last sermon, I am inclined to think that it would not be spoken of as "a beautiful discourse" or "an eloquent and learned address."

There is nothing so much needed in our theological seminaries as the teaching young men how to preach—if, indeed, that is a thing which can be *taught*. Some men are born preachers, and others are not; and it is doubtful whether there is any process by which they could be made preachers any more than you can make a poet. Still there are many things which our candidates for the ministry might be taught—such lessons, for instance, as are contained in Bishop Brook's well-known "Lectures on Preaching," and which have helped so many.

It may seem as if we were coming down to a lower level when we speak of the voice as a most important element in preaching; but there can be no question that the dullness of the pulpit is very often attributable to some defect of utterance. There are certain preachers who seem to make no special effort to be heard at all—indistinct in their enunciation, chewing up the consonants in every complicated word, most inaudible when they intend to be most impressive; at first you make an effort to listen, because there seems to be something worth hearing behind all this mumble of words, but you soon give it up, and the discourse upon which the speaker has expended his best efforts in the composition never reaches the hearts of the congregation, because it never found entrance into their ears. Another man is distinct enough, but it is a dreary monotony of sound—no variation from the beginning to the end; "a drowsy tinkling," which always ends in "lulling the fold" to slumber. On the other hand, there are preachers who begin with a shout and end with a shout—the howling of the wind never abates; it rises higher and higher

until the bellows gives out, and then the noise is over.

There are some persons whose natural tone of voice is such as should exclude them from the pulpit altogether—cold, hard, rasping, rough, incapable of tenderness or real earnestness, grating all the while like a rusty saw that is constantly striking a nail in the log; people who have such voices as this should address the public through the eye and not through the ear.

Every utterance of the soul has its appropriate tone, and cannot be fully expressed except through the medium of that tone. In every-day conversation we strike the true note unconsciously; every emotion creates its true utterance; the tones of anger, rebuke, contempt are never misunderstood; the Billingsgate fishwoman always scolds in the right key. The tones of love and tenderness are just as unmistakable. By a change in the inflection the meaning of a sentence may be reversed. If I am asked whether a certain man really believes what he is saying, and I reply, "He believes it as much as he believes in the existence of a God," the significance of the answer is determined altogether by the use of the downward or the circumflex accent.

No sermon can be true unless it is delivered in the true tone; neither can it be edifying or interesting. The dullness of the pulpit is owing, in a great degree, to the want of tone, in more senses than one. Unless there is some perversity in the man's nature, it might be presumed that earnestness would of necessity induce the true tone; and yet how rarely do we hear from the pulpit just the quality of voice which the sentiment demands. Would that what is known as "the holy tone" might be forever banished from our churches, and all our preachers would speak and read as nature teaches them to speak, and as they certainly would if they could forget all about themselves in the message they are called to deliver.

To say of a sermon that "it was not very dull" is not the highest praise; a discourse may be lively to a fault, and at the same time utterly unprofitable. I once heard a sermon that reminded me of the simultaneous discharge of all the various materials collected for an elaborate pyrotechnical display; from the beginning to the end the air seemed to be blazing with Roman candles, and fiery serpents, and sparkling wheels, and coruscating rockets, and when the show was over,

"Blinded by excess of light,"

everything seemed darker than it was before.

There was more or less of this high-flown sermonizing in Dr. South's day, as would appear from what he says in commenting on the words of St. Paul, "I preach not with the enticing words of man's wisdom." "Nothing here," says Dr. South, "of 'the fringe of the north star'; nothing of 'nature's becoming unnatural'; nothing of 'the down of angels' wings'; or 'the beautiful locks of cherubim'; no starched similitudes introduced with a 'Thus have I seen a cloud rolling in its airy mansion,' and the like. No; these were similitudes above the rise of apostolic spirit; for the apostles, poor mortals, were content to take lower steps, and to tell the world in plain terms that he who believeth shall be saved, and that he who believeth not shall be damned."

If all our preachers would take into serious account the actual condition of the people whom they address, what a revolution there would be in the pulpit! What power there may be in a simple word of warning, or counsel, or comfort, or instruction!

Right before the preacher a man may be seated who is on the verge of some great crime; the tempest is at this moment raging in his soul; conscience remonstrates, but her voice is every moment becoming weaker; the risk is terrible, but then the prize is so dazzling; the man is almost ready to yield, his feet are on the brink, when the low, pleading voice falls upon his ear, "Wilt thou do this great thing, my son, and sin against thy God?" and he is saved.

Not far off another hearer may be seated who, as it seems to him, has already sinned beyond redemption; he has not yet gone to hell, but hell has come to him, and the grip of despair is on his soul. The secret of his sin is buried out of sight, and no one knows of it but God; this only makes it all the harder to bear. *Hope* is dead; is there no message for this miserable man? In the midst of the darkness and the storm the blessed words steal into his soul: "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin. Come unto me and I will give you rest." Gradually the darkness is dissipated, and he finds peace in believing.

In yonder pew there may be seen another who is racked with doubt; the foundation of his faith is giving way—a cloud is gathering that makes everything obscure and ghostly; he feels that when his trust in the Gospel is gone, all that made life worth living for has gone; but he is distracted by doubts and difficulties that stagger him; can the preacher do anything to help this poor man? Not unless he knows how to give him *real* help; not unless he knows

how to present the truth in such a way as to lift it out of the reach of microscopic criticism, so that it shall shine, as the sun does, by its own light.

In a remote corner of the church one may be seen upon whom the hand of sorrow has fallen—the light has gone out in her dwelling, and she is alone. There is nothing left on earth to comfort her; the commonplaces of sympathy give her no relief; she wants something that has Christ's impress upon it; she longs to touch the hem of His garment, and bathe His feet with her tears, and hear Him speak to her. Has the minister of Christ no true word for her?

There may be still another hearer—an aged father in Israel who has long been familiar with the ways of godliness. He comes to church because he loves to be there; he comes to worship, and might be content if no sermon were preached; but, if it is to be preached, he wants to hear something that will lift him up and help him forward. He wants to hear something about Christ, and His work and His dealings with His people; he wants to be built up and edified, and have his own way made more clear. Now that the end is approaching he wants to be brought nearer to his Saviour, and have some fresh assurance of the glories that are to come. Is it not hard when such a good old believer as this is fed with nothing but dust and chaff?

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

### PERSONAL CHRISTIANITY.\*

BY REV. LLEWELYN I. EVANS, D.D., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CINCINNATI, O.

MOST concisely, although not, perhaps, in all respects most satisfactorily, I may state the theme of the present discussion to be *Personal Christianity*. The phrase may call for a word or two of justification. Can Christianity be anything but personal? An impersonal Christianity—would not that be a logical self-contradiction? True; but unfortunately our practical thinking is already full of self-contradictions, and the only way oftentimes to meet these successfully is to insist on the truisms or the tautologies which they obscure or deny. When Christianity becomes

\* Opening Address, delivered at Lane Theological Seminary, September 10, 1891.

a dead s  
that the  
tianity.  
like ide  
histori  
into a  
reprocla  
undue p  
imperso  
affirm v  
of a per

Person  
of all th  
Christia  
of all th  
persona  
Christi  
persona  
ity—the  
ity bet  
fusion.  
and the  
tianity  
largest  
the tr  
life.

Let  
much  
most f  
and li  
apprel  
person  
was n  
sonali  
throw  
mecha  
power  
and t  
tion.  
Refor

in the  
does  
woul  
ism i  
to th  
the a  
it w  
etern  
ple o  
when  
this  
ance  
life,  
pers  
brin  
with  
P  
of p  
ized  
acc  
ligio

a dead shell, we need to remind ourselves that there is such a thing as vital Christianity. When it is sublimated into dream-like idealities, we are required to emphasize historic Christianity. When it degenerates into a mechanical formalism, it is time to reproclaim a spiritual Christianity. When undue prominence is given to its abstract, impersonal factors, we shall do well to reaffirm with all earnestness the predication of a personal Christianity.

Personality—the highest and the greatest of all the general predications of existence; Christianity—the highest and the greatest of all the special predications of existence; personality—the highest type of reality; Christianity—the highest type of quality; personality—the divinest entity; Christianity—the divinest expression—the vital affinity between these two predestinates their fusion. Personality is alike the primary and the ultimate fact of Christianity; Christianity assures to personality its purest and largest significance. Their synthesis is the transcendent reality of being and of life.

Let me ask you to reflect a moment how much it means that the profoundest and most fruitful movements of religious thought and life have their root in the more vital apprehension of the fact and implications of personality. The Protestant Reformation was nothing less than the uprising of personality as a spiritual force in the effort to throw off the dead weight of mediæval mechanicalism. Mark the vitality and the power of individualism both in the formal and the material principles of the Reformation. Take the formal principle of the Reformation—the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture—wherein does its significance lie? Just in this; it would push aside every interruptive mechanism in the transmission of the Divine Word to the hungry soul of man. Rejecting the artificial jets of ecclesiastical gas works, it would drink its light straight from the eternal stars. Or take the material principle of Protestantism, justification by faith; wherein does its significance lie? Just in this: it would sweep away every contrivance which, in the great crisis of the spiritual life, would intervene between the Divine personality and the human personality, and bring the soul by faith into direct contact with a living, infinite Saviour.

Puritanism in like manner is the protest of pure personality, quickened and spiritualized, against the more impure and impersonal accretions of a materialized sensuous religion. Its affirmation of simplicity has for

its motive the desire to rid the renewed spirit of all that would encumber and hamper its free outgoing toward God, and its full internal reception of God.

In Methodism, again, alike of Wesley and of Whitefield, we see the insurgence of the Christian personality against enervating conventionalisms, deadening rubrics of an exhausted formalism, the benumbing blight of a secularized church. Methodism is thus the voice of the Christian consciousness repudiating its dependence on external, decaying appliances, asserting itself against the repressions of empty routine and hearsay, and seeking to put itself once more in communication with the primary, personal sources of the deepest, most sacred and abiding experiences of the soul.

Or look again at the spiritualism to which Schleiermacher, Neander, and Coleridge have given an impulse: what does it mean? In its inmost essence it means the rejection of the unrealities, the abstractions and assumptions of a religious empiricism, or of a traditional mechanicalism, or of an *à priori* dogmatism, which has lost its grasp on the immediacy and certitude of the personal communion between the living God and His children.

In a word, every spiritual awakening or advance in religious development approves itself as a movement from a Religion of Things, of forms, institutions, external and more or less material mediations; from a religion of words, abstractions, dogmas, traditions, second-hand appurtenances, to a Religion of Personality—a religion which accords their full value to the factors of the largest personal life, which quickens into the most intense activity the central, dominant forces of consciousness—a religion of living, personal powers without, and of vivid personal qualities within, correlated to each other at first hand, and acting on each other under the laws of a direct, sublime, divine reciprocity. From a Religion of Things to a Religion of Personality—there you have the essential note of all spiritual progress.

Indeed, when you come to think of it, all progress defines itself as the advance of personality, the triumph of free spirit over the impersonal environment. Material progress—is it not just that: *personality* handling, moulding the things which surround it, asserting its mastery over them, impressing itself on nature, transfusing and assimilating all material conditions, elements and forces to its own uses and life? Scientific progress—is it not just that: finding the key of *personal thought and purpose* which

unlocks the mysteries of the universe? Science is on the hunt for Law; and what is Law but the expression of the uniformity of Personal Thinking and Wiling underlying all phenomena of change and movement? Nature is thus the transcript of personal processes, the movements of the Eternal Mind. Leave out the Thinker, of what worth the Thought? Nay, is not its reality as thought, as well as its value, due to the Mind back of it? The discovery of truth is, in a word, finding out the ways and workings of the Supreme Reason. Herein lies the fascination of every such discovery; it introduces a thinking mind to the Infinite Thinker. Its joy is the joy of thinking, with Kepler, God's thoughts after him. Truth has thus both its source and destination in personality.

Beauty, too, which eludes every definition, but the attraction of which attests none the less its supremacy, depends for its power and charm on its spiritual source and quality. Its correspondences, harmonies, graces, its subtle, melting winsomeness, its entrancing, purifying virtue have their norm in the Divine Soul, with whom the fairest dreams, the purest loves, the sweetest raptures have their eternal home.

Leave out the personal factor, and you have but a crude congeries of things, *rudis indigestaque moles*, of no significance or worth. But bring all into its proper correspondence to personality; put matter in its place, mind in its place, God in His place, man in his place, and chaos becomes cosmos, and the discord of atoms resolves itself into the music of the spheres.

"The sequences of law  
We learn through mind alone,  
'Tis only through the soul  
That aught we know is known:  
With equal voice she tells  
Of what we touch and see  
Within these bounds of life,  
And of a life to be:  
Proclaiming One who brought us hither,  
And holds the keys of *Whence and Whither*."

Until Mind appears, Matter has no story to tell. But

"Man once descried imprints forever  
His presence on all lifeless things; the winds  
Are henceforth voices, . . .  
Never a senseless gust now man is born!  
The herded pines commune and have deep thoughts.

\* \* \* \* \*

The morn has enterprise, deep quiet droops  
With evening, triumph takes the sunset hour,  
And this to fill us with regard for man,  
Desire to work his proper nature out.

. . . All tended to mankind,  
And, man produced, all has its end thus far:  
But in completed man begins anew  
The tendency to God."

This "progress is the law of life," through matter to mind, through mind to God—all from, through, to God:

"Himself the way that leads us thither,  
The All-in-All, the Whence and Whither."

If, then, all progress defines itself as the advance and triumph of personality, much more will this be true of Christianity, by which alone progress along the most spiritual and divine lines is possible for man.

I would have you now trace with me the line of this divine movement—so far, at least, as to glance at a few of the outstanding headlands which mark its majestic course. And let me ask you at the outset not to prejudice the discussion as either unpractical or superfluous. I am greatly mistaken if it shall not appear that a more distinct and vital apprehension of Christianity as a Religion of Personality in contrast with a Religion of Things is the one thing needed just now to correct and enlarge our conceptions of its contents, and to recover for our Christian thinking, living, and experience much of the power which has been lost.

If we are asked: "What is the pre-eminent claim which Christianity makes in its own behalf?" our answer would be: "It claims, first of all, and chiefest of all, to possess and to disclose the secret of salvation." If asked: "Wherein lies the need of salvation?" our answer to this again would be: "In sin." And what is sin? The secret of salvation involves the secret of sin; and the secret of sin lies in personality. Personality is the power of being other than a thing, the power of free choice, free activity, free development. What we call a *Thing* has no such power. Its history is a part of the series of causalities, of necessary changes and effects, that we call Nature. Its course is absolutely and irresistibly determined by conditions outside of itself. It cannot be other than it is; it cannot do other than it does. In such a history there can be no sin. But neither in such a history can there be freedom; and in the absence of freedom the higher developments of life, of growth, of blessedness are forever impossible.

Professor Huxley has said: "I protest that if some great Power would agree to make me always think what is true, and do what is right on condition of being turned into a sort of clock and wound up every

morning  
instantly  
freedom  
right; t  
to part  
one one  
mons: O  
ing decl  
moral ca  
its own  
turned i  
ing wha  
would e  
For a m  
such ten  
it is a m  
it goes  
made up  
and wou  
had no  
vidly  
wanted  
else, for  
never do  
never g  
it. In  
necessa  
would  
would l  
be no r  
do right  
power r  
defy G  
put sel  
and the  
inalien  
And th  
is the  
sonalit  
to abdi  
to sub  
urging  
the bo  
mits si  
This  
ism, th  
of per  
of sin.  
to be l  
exister  
sequen  
simply  
stumb  
for sin  
tianty,  
Christ  
with t  
us not  
fact—  
made  
the al



morning before I got out of bed, I should instantly close with the offer. The only freedom I care about is the freedom to do right; the freedom to do wrong I am ready to part with on the cheapest terms to any one who will take it of me" (Lay Sermons: On Descartes' Discourse). This striking declaration, much as we may admire its moral earnestness, furnishes the elements of its own refutation. If Mr. Huxley could be turned into a clock, the question of thinking what is true and doing what is right would cease to be a question for him at all. For a machine there is, there can be no such term as right or truth. To the clock it is a matter of absolute indifference whether it goes right or wrong. Mr. Huxley, if made up of clock wheels and clock springs, and wound up every morning, would have had no such desire to do right as he so vividly expresses. He would not even have wanted to be a clock, or to be anything else, for the sake of going right. A machine never does right; it never wants to. A thing never goes wrong; it does not care about it. In a world of things, of machines, of necessary causations, right or wrongdoing would be a matter of no concern; there would be no recognition of sin, there could be no recognition of holiness. Freedom to do right means freedom to do wrong. The power to be godlike implies the power to defy God, to usurp the throne of God, to put self in the place of God. That is sin; and the power to commit sin is one of the inalienable, awful attributes of personality. And the further terrible penalty of that sin is the loss of the conscious dignity of personality, *the willingness to become a thing*, to abdicate the freedom of a child of God, to submit to the iron causality of influences urging to evil, and thus to be immured in the bondage of corruption. "He that commits sin is the bondman of sin."

This, too, is the curse of scientific materialism, that, having begun with the evacuation of personality, it ends with the elimination of sin. What theologians call sin it declares to be but one of the myriad mischances of existence, brought about by the evolutionary sequences of nature. The Fall of Man is simply a necessary incident of progress, a stumbling upward. Having thus no place for sin, materialism has no place for Christianity; and this belittling of sin and of Christianity, mark you, goes hand in hand with the belittling of personality. For let us not lose sight of the great retributive fact—to which reference has already been made—that sin, being in its root and essence the abdication of the regal rights and func-

tions of personality, means the permanent degradation of manhood, the launching of a personal agent on the career of a thing, imposing the law of necessity in place of the law of liberty; bringing the higher nature into bondage to the lower; clipping the wings of the angel and bidding him to crawl in the trail of the worm.

This, alas! is the moral condition that confronts us in a fallen world; a condition how hopeless in and of itself! How can a thing—a thing, too, by choice—become a person? how can a self-enthralled slave be made free? how can the earthly put on the Heavenly One? Here is the problem to which Christianity addresses itself. What is the first condition of the solution of this problem? Manifestly it is the restoration of personality to its rights and functions, the resumption by the angel of the wings wherewith it may soar above the attractions and gravitations of the natural life, and rise to the loftiness, largeness, liberty, energy, beauty, and fulness of a life in the immediate presence of God, and in living touch with Him.

And how is this result to be effected? Manifestly by the intervention of a Power from beyond the World of Things, by the influx of the Supernatural into the realm of the natural. For Nature cannot emancipate from nature. The life of a Thing, or a life which has degenerated into the life of a Thing, cannot lift itself up to the full height and measure of a free, Godlike personality. The Divine Personality must stoop down, touch the lower, degenerated life, communicate itself to that life, impart to it its own life. Christianity is thus—objectively, the communication to man of the Divine Personal Life; subjectively, the reception by man of that Divine Personal Life; concretely, the re-establishment in man of his lost personal life and divineness. As Christ says, it is the prodigal "coming to himself," the outcast coming to the realization of the Divine sonship, and of "the freedom wherewith the Son makes free." In the religious dialect of Peter, it is becoming "partakers of the Divine Nature." In the vivid sententiousness of James, it is "the perfect law, the law of liberty," "the royal law" of love; "royal" as being not only the king among laws, but the law of kings, enfranchising those who obey it into the rank and rights of kingship. In the lofty mysticism of John, it is the indwelling of the Divine Life in such fulness and power that absolute freedom becomes inability to sin. "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his

seed abideth in him ; and he cannot sin because he is begotten of God ;" and there you have Christianity's answer to Mr. Huxley's yearning after a freedom to do right which will never go wrong. In the dramatic, psychological realism of Paul, it is the Saul-ego dying into the Paul-ego, and the Paul-ego transformed into the Christ-ego. "I no longer live, but Christ liveth in me ; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, that faith which is in the Son of God." "For me to live is Christ."

Christianity thus presupposes as its fundamental postulate that man's true life consists in communion with God. God is the spiritual complement of a perfect manhood, the element, the atmosphere, the home of the soul.

"God only is the creature's home,  
Though rough and strait the road ;  
Yet nothing less can satisfy  
The love that longs for God."

Man's redemption is accordingly the re-establishment of this Divine Communion, God making His home in man, man finding his home in God. "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him." There is an awakening of manhood in the awakening of the God-consciousness within. To see God, to know God, to realize God, this is the first condition of seeing, knowing, realizing my true being.

Now this—let me emphasize the thought—is an intensely personal process. First, you see, it presupposes the personal activity of God in making Himself known, in realizing Himself to me.

"'Tis rather God who seeks for us,  
Than we who seek for Him.  
God was not gone, but He so longed  
His sweetness to impart,  
He, too, was seeking for a bane,  
And found it in my heart."

The revelation of God to the soul—what is it? A thing, a definition, a dogma, a book, an impersonal medium? Impossible! In any revelation of God, the chief factor, the central, the real factor, the factor without which every circumstantiality were an empty, meaningless form, is God Himself. Given God, all else matters but little ; given God, and all the rest will follow. Let God be there, and the acacia bush in the wilderness will burn with the splendors of the Shekinah. Let God be in it, and the prattling of the babe will say more than the logic of the archangel. The revelation thus derives its original and special significance from the supreme personality of its Divine Agent.

But this is not all. The process is one of living personal reciprocity. By the divine correlation of energy the personal activity of God passes over into personal activity on the part of man. "If that I may apprehend that for which also I was apprehended." Before the revelation can be in any sense real and complete, the personal reciprocity must respond to the personal communication. The more of personality there is in the receiving, the larger will be the revelation. This, you see, must be so. There can be no revelation of personality to a thing. There can be no spiritual revelation to an unspiritual intelligence, for spiritualities are spiritually discerned. The thoughts which wander through eternity, the sensibilities which find relief in tears, nay, which do often lie too deep for tears, the spiritual intuitions of divine realities and necessities,

"Which are the fountain-light of all our day,  
The master-light of all our seeing,"

the moral convictions, which, like the bird of Jove, grasp the thunderbolts of everlasting law, the deathless yearning after immortality, the delight in truth and right for their own sake, the power of self-sacrifice for love's sweet sake, the enthusiasm of humanity, the inspiration of divinity—all this finds no response below the level of personality, and, indeed, of spiritual personality. The revelation of the supreme, all-perfect personality that we call God can be conveyed only to the reason, the conscience, the will, to the instinct of beauty, the power of love, the sense of the infinite, the presentiment of eternity. It becomes a revelation through the appeal which it makes to these divine constituents of our being, and the response which it evokes therefrom. God revealing Himself to me—what is that? It is God correlating Himself to this part and to that part of my being, moving on this faculty, capturing that sentiment, energizing such a motive, asserting Himself in such a purpose, illuminating a thought here, sweetening an experience there. But mark it! these activities are each and all my own. My personality expresses itself in them. I am in them ; God too is in them : through them I learn to interpret, to realize, to know God. Apart from them God were a blank ; apart from God they were but shadows, mere possibilities. Their activity is made real by His. It is His coming into my life which makes it life. It is He that puts to flight the nightmare of the evil past ; it is His touch that quickens, that starts the vital currents, that stirs the impulses of devotion

and service. So does Paul teach, "That which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God manifested it unto them." That is to say, the external and the internal revelation condition each the other. Or, as Jacobi puts it, the consonant of the one finds its vowel in the other; and thus the Word, the revelation of God, is made complete. The Unknown God, whom before I ignorantly worshipped, if at all, becomes known to me. He is become a reality; I have found Him. "If, happily, they might feel after Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us." "Too late!" so does Augustine pour out his soul in one of his wonderful apostrophes: "Too late I loved Thee, O Thou Beauty of ancient days, yet ever new! Too late I loved Thee! And behold, Thou wert within and I abroad, and there I searched for Thee; deformed I, plunging amid those fair forms which Thou hadst made. Thou wert with me, but I was not with Thee. Things held me far from Thee, which, unless they were in Thee, were not at all. Thou didst call and shout and burst my deafness. Thou didst breathe odors, and I drew in breath and panted for Thee. I tasted—and hunger and thirst. Thou touchedst me, and I burned for Thy peace" (Confessions, Book X.). Even so; God touching me until my being is on fire with Himself; God thinking Himself into my thoughts; God loving Himself into my love; God living Himself into my life—that is revelation, that is religion, that is Christianity, that is life! "With Thee is the fountain of life; in Thy light shall we see light." What I see as a luminous, indubitable reality, I see in God's light. In that outstreaming of God, that Divine halo, I exercise intuition, reflection, faith, worship. God's shining is all around me and through me; in that shining I behold and believe. God's warmth is all about me and within me; in that warmth I feel. God's love floods my being; in that love I love.

Our personal activities are thus respondent to the personal activities of God. "We love because He first loved us." The consciousness of God heightens, deepens, widens the sense of our personal consciousness; and in this enlargement and exaltation of the latter God becomes credible, knowable, real. The dignity of personality in man, the reality of personality in God—each conditions the other. In every revelation God must be interpreted through the soul. The objective self-manifestation of God necessarily comes first; but this can become a completed revelation only through the subjective

interpretation and appropriation. God becomes a part of me only through my partaking of Him.

Monergism and Synergism are equally true, and each is necessary to the other. Without monergism—*i.e.*, without the primal Divine Energy, there can be no synergism—*i.e.*, there can be no answering co-operant energy of the human coefficient. Without synergism—*i.e.*, without the co-operating human coefficient, monergism would fail of its consummation; for even the Divine Energy is graduated by that in which it works. The Divine Energy in the worm cannot furnish the measure of the Divine Energy in Augustine, or Luther, or Wesley. The more the man, the more the God within him; the more the God within, the more the man. Our Lord's paradox, "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham," is an incontrovertible truth, but it is the truth of hyperbole. As a matter of fact, God never does raise a spiritual aristocracy out of dead stones. But, as the Apostle Paul shows, the seed of Abraham embraces those, and only those who are of the faith of Abraham (Gal. iii. 7); and the faith of Abraham, as the same Apostle shows (Rom. iv. 19-21), is the highest exponent of spiritual energy which the world has ever seen; the noblest activity of which a finite personality is capable. Through that activity, as the Apostle James also shows (ii. 23), Abraham reached the loftiest personal dignity to which man can aspire. "Abraham believed God . . . and he was called the friend of God."

A parallel truth we find in the inspired teaching that we attain to the Vision of God through personal self-purification. "Follow after the sanctification, without which no man shall see the Lord." "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." And how much is implied in that wonderful declaration of our Lord's, "This is life eternal that they should know Thee, the only true God, and Him whom Thou didst send, even Jesus Christ"! Mark the expression! The highest possible knowledge of God, the knowledge of God in the uniqueness and the reality of His being, is life; not a single activity of life—not intellectual life merely, not moral life alone, but life itself in its generic fulness and absoluteness; eternal life, the climax, the maximum of life, life at its highest, longest, largest, best. But mark, farther, the complete statement! "This is life eternal, to know God and Him whom God sent, even Jesus Christ," to know God, that is, in the ultimate expression of Himself, in the definite, historic,

personal embodiment of His perfections and purposes in Jesus Christ.

And here we strike upon the very core of Christianity as the Religion of the Incarnation. As was said already, Christianity is characteristically not a Religion of Things, not a religion of abstractions or dogmas, but of Personal Realities. It is so pre-eminently in its revelation of God. In Christianity we have, if I may say so, the ultimatum of the Divine Personality. The Religion of Nature gives us indeed a personal God; but this truth is beset with constant peril from the liabilities of our sinful humanity, from a debased anthropomorphism, a vague pantheism, a coarse materialism, a shallow pyrrhonism. Even in Judaism the Divine Personality is lost in a Divine Legality. The Law itself, by which God speaks, comes between the people and God. At the reading of Moses a veil lieth upon the heart. Everywhere, in Gentilism and in Judaism, there is still something lacking to keep the world in touch with God. The Most High must come lower yet, nearer yet to man. There must be a face-to-face beholding of the Divine Glory, heart-to-heart contact with the Divine Life. This is what the Gospel assures us took place in the Incarnation. In Christ the veil is taken away. He is the last and the greatest of the Theophanies. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." "The Word was God . . . and the Word became flesh, and tabernacled among us." In the Incarnate Logos the Divine Personality becomes a historic, visible, audible, tangible reality. "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld and our hands handled, concerning the Word of Life (and the life was manifested, and we have seen and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us), that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you."

Christ is the practical answer to the difficulties and contradictions of our earthly metaphysics in its speculations about the Divine Personality. In Christ we find the actual reconciliation of the Infinite with the limitations of a personal consciousness. In Christ as a historic personality, the belief in a personal God ceases to be an insoluble logical paradox, and becomes a rapturous, inspiring reality. At His feet our Doubt falls down in lowly, holy adoration, crying out, "My Lord and my God?" Christ—who will not admit it?—Christ is the living personal embodiment of the Highest Being,

of the Most Perfect Life. In Him the Fullness of the Godhead dwelleth bodily, and in Him we are made full. Out of Him remains the infinite void, the eternal unrest. "My heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God." "Oh, that I knew where I might find Him!" So rings out the wail of the ages, the sad refrain of humanity.

Where is God?—for a God man must have. "If there were no God it would be necessary to invent Him." Even so, Voltaire. Thought must have a God—an Infinite in relation to whom there is no Beyond. Worship must have a God—a Highest than whom there can be no Higher. Conscience must have a God—a Supreme Will, whose absolute masterhood is law, whose Yea is life, whose Nay is death. Love must have a God—consummate Perfection, forever satisfying the enlarging capacities, the crescent hopes, the ever-mounting aspirations, the ever-widening and deepening activities of the ever-growing life eternal. Oh God! God! God! Where shall we look for Thee? Where shall we find Thee? Our thoughts scale the firmaments; where art Thou? Our prayers climb the heavens; where art Thou? Our dreams soar over the infinities and sweep through the eternities; where art Thou? Our speculations plunge into the blazing, blinding suns of light; where art Thou? Our despair storms the darkness, and treads the pathless depths of mystery; where, oh, where art Thou?

Ah! my soul, not thus shalt thou find God, not thus shalt thou enter into thy rest. "The Righteousness which is of faith saith thus: Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? That is to bring Christ down; or, Who shall descend into the abyss? That is to bring Christ up from the dead. But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart: that is the word of faith which we preach." Philip cries out: "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." Jesus answers, "Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father; how sayest thou, Show us the Father?" "They shall call His name Immanuel." God with us! God in the midst of us! God on earth; among men; Himself a man; stooping to the depths; lifting to the heights; bearing humanity's burdens; sharing the world's woes; weeping human tears; fainting from the weakness of the flesh; pouring forth human blood, yet bringing into the weakness and guilt and misery of earth, bringing into the broken, bleeding

life of m  
thy, the  
ness, the  
Infinite  
more?  
find Hi  
Wisdom  
where c  
in pres  
Higher  
what of  
the alle  
yoke?  
tion can  
excellen  
unto u  
do mor  
revelati  
tery of  
He put  
that ha  
puts m  
hood.  
gave H  
The  
festatio  
from I  
pressio  
tianty  
ture is  
man h  
begott  
He ha  
God i  
tural  
Chris  
person  
Chris  
alone  
somet  
Chris  
prese  
worl  
dogm  
Chris  
The  
agen  
"the  
The  
the  
Is th  
the  
Pers  
the  
divi  
Aye  
Rom  
and  
the  
tion  
nee



life of man the condescension, the sympathy, the strength, the wisdom, the righteousness, the holiness, the love, the All of the Infinite God! Having this, what need we more? If God be not here, where shall we find Him? Christ! for this Infinite of Wisdom, Power, Righteousness, Love, where can thought find a Beyond? Christ! in presence of this Highest, where is the Higher can woo away our worship? Christ! what other Master can ever claim or win the allegiance of the soul that wears His voice? Christ! what fuller, larger Perfection can ever lure our love from His supreme excellence? Christ! what can God be more unto us than Christ is? wherein can God do more for us than Christ does? The revelation of Christ solves forever the mystery of personality, whether in God or man. He puts man in possession of God. "He that hath the Son hath the Father." Christ puts man in possession of the divinest manhood. "As many as received Him, to them gave He the right to become sons of God."

The Divine Life in all its forms and manifestations thus centres in Christ, radiates from Him. Religion reaches its highest expression in this Divine-Human Life. Christianity means Christ. Theology in Scripture is first and chiefly Christology. "No man hath seen God at any time; God only-begotten, who is in the bosom of the father, He hath declared Him." The doctrine of God is the doctrine—that is, in true Scriptural usage, the teaching, the exegesis of Christ; not dogma about Christ, but the personal teaching of Christ Himself. And Christianity is not the teaching of Christ alone, but All of Christ. Not, I say again, something about Christ, but the Living Christ attesting Himself by His personal presence and His personal work in the world. Christianity is not a Thing, a dogma, a system, a process, but a person; Christianity, once and again, means Christ. The Church is not a Thing, a machine, an agency; the Church means Christ, for it is "the Fulness of Him that filleth all in all." The Bible is not a Thing, not the letter, the book, but the Spirit: "and the Lord is the Spirit." The Bible means Christ. The life of the Written Word is the living Personal Word. The truth means Christ, the whole of Christ. "Has Christ been divided?" Alas! Paul, yes. In Corinth? Aye, and in Antioch and Alexandria, in Rome and in Geneva, in the first century and in the nineteenth. We have divided the Living Christ into partial representations, half-living dogmas about Christ. We need once more to personalize our truths

and our beliefs, to find in Christ the eternal incarnation, the living impersonation of the great verities and realities of our faith.

There is an earnest cry for a Christo-centric, and, if I may add an adjective, a Christometric theology. I heartily unite in the cry. Christ at the centre; Christ also as the radius, measuring with His infinitude every truth that radiates from that centre. No less a measure than the Christ-measure will suffice for any fact or truth of Christianity. Do we inquire respecting God's eternal purpose? Let us seek the interpretation and the metre in Christ. Sovereignty, election, predestination? Each is a paraphrase of Christ. Whatever Christ means, sovereignty means that. Wherever Christ reaches, grace reaches there. As large as Christ may be, so large is God's redemptive purpose. Atonement is no mere Divine mechanism, the skilful adjustment of expedients or balancing of equivalents. "HE is the propitiation for our sins," CHRIST in the breach, CHRIST filling the dreadful chasm occasioned by sin, CHRIST reaching all the way from the trembling culprit to the Throne with its everlasting thunders. Redemption is no mere formula, no prescription from a Divine pharmacopœia. Throughout it is Christ's personal efficiency. The measure of Christ, of His personality, of His personal force and life, that is the measure of redemption. He gives the breadth and length and height and depth of it. Redemption is Christ. He is the All of it. "Of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who was made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." Mark well the statement: Christ was made Wisdom, and Christ was made Righteousness, and Christ was made Sanctification, and Christ was made Redemption. Our wisdom is not a creed, but a Person; our righteousness is not an abstract quality, but a Personal Reality; our sanctification is not an impersonal process, but a Personal Life; our redemption is not a supernatural life-saving apparatus, but a Personal God, putting Himself into the work of our salvation. Formulas, creeds, arrangements, institutions, things of whatever kind, are well enough in their place, but that place is secondary. Christ first—all the rest will follow.

"I am The Way, The Truth, and The Life." Brethren, as we start on the work of our new seminary year, let us take those words as our motto. Let us make Christ our way, our path in every line of research, the chart by which we determine every step, the method by which we strive for every

goal, the philosophy of our life, of duty, and of destiny. Let us make Christ our Truth; Truth not as a logical abstraction, but as a Divine Impersonation; the Truth which is the core of all that is true, the pith of all integrity, the substance of all reality—that which we see with the eye of Christ, which we test by the mind of Christ, which we assimilate by the spirit of Christ. Christ in every truth, until it becomes an apocalypse of the ineffable Glory! Let it be our aim not to learn about Christ, but, in Pauline phrase, “to learn Christ.” Let us make Christ our Life; the principle and law of our living, the sum of all our being, our having, our doing. Let all be from, through, in, unto Christ. Our surrender to others, our devotion to humanity, let it be for His sake. What we do for ourselves, let it be for Christ. Seek the most full and accurate knowledge—for Christ! the broadest culture—for Christ! the largest and most vigorous unfolding of all your powers and capacities—for Christ! Personal Christianity transformed into the grandest Christian personality—all for Christ’s sake! “Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee.” Oh, for that waking! to come forth into that sunrise! Out of all our darkness and weakness, our numbness and deadness, into the light, the glow, the power, and the glory of that beatific CHRIST-SHINE! Thus to shine with the Christ be it your pre-eminent privilege and Service.

“What is this psalm from pitiable places  
Glad where the messengers of peace have  
trod?  
Whose are those beautiful and holy faces  
Lit with their loving, and aflame with God?”

“Aye unto these distributeth the Giver  
Sorrow and sanctity, and loves them well,  
Grants them a power and passion to deliver  
Hearts from the prison-house and souls from  
hell?”

“This hath He done, and shall we not adore Him?  
This shall He do, and can we still despair?  
Come, let us quickly fling ourselves before Him,  
Cast at His feet the burden of our care,

“Flash from our eyes the glow of our thank-  
giving,  
Glad and regretful, confident and calm,  
Then through all life, and what is after living  
Thrill to the tireless music of a psalm.

“Yea, through life, death, through sorrow and  
through sinning  
He shall suffice me, for He hath sufficed;  
Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,  
Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ.”

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

## THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

(Condensed translation, by Rev. Professor George H. Schodde, Ph.D., Capital University, Columbus, O., of article entitled “Die Römische Zukunft Englands,” by the Licentiat R. Buddensieg, Ph.D., of Dresden, in the “Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift,” 1890, Nos. 8 and 9.)

THE question as to which of the two great rival churches—the Roman Catholic or the Protestant—is making the more rapid strides toward securing the supremacy in the religious world has, in recent years, as is seen from the repeated discussions of the problem, become a burning issue of the day. These discussions have, among other things, brought to light an abundance of statistical data which have an all-important bearing on the solution of the vexed question; and in the end the statistical is the correct method by which to seek and secure this solution. Some of these data and figures are exceedingly instructive on the general bearings of the problem, and speak strongly and significantly for the relatively superior progress of Protestant Christianity. In the year 1885 the number of Christians was 452,000,000—namely, 92,000,000 of the Oriental Orthodox Church, 210,000,000 Roman Catholics, and 150,000,000 Protestants. According to the statistics of 1886, Europe contained 154,000,000 Roman Catholics, 85,000,000 Protestants, and 83,000,000 Greek Catholics. Since the numbers in 1786 were 80,000,000 Roman Catholics, 37,000,000 Protestants, and 40,000,000 Greek Christians, the past century shows a growth of 230 per cent on the part of Protestantism, 207 per cent on the part of Greek Catholicism, and only 192 per cent on the part of Roman Catholicism. Still more noteworthy are the facts when the Anglo-Saxon sections of the American continent are also taken into consideration. In 1786 Europe and America had a Protestant population of 39,700,000, and a Roman Catholic population of 110,190,000. In 1886 the figures were 134,500,000 Protestants and 201,000,000 Roman Catholics. From this it appears that the Protestants increased 3.36 times; the Roman Catholics only 1.81 times—i.e., Protestantism made almost twice the advance that Roman Catholicism did.

These facts and their lesson are confirmed by sources that cannot be charged with denominational bias or prejudice. The London *Times* recently discussed in detail the religious statistics of the American conti-

ment, and came to the conclusion that proportionally Protestantism was advancing vastly more rapidly than Roman Catholicism. Ravenstein, who is generally regarded as a careful and reliable statistician, claims that proportionally Roman Catholicism has retrograded 23 per cent in America; that in England the Romanism of Ireland is being absorbed by Protestantism with the same rapidity; that the visions of Wiseman and Manning of a speedy conquest of England by Rome "has become more silly than ever."

Similar conclusions are reached by A. O. van Lennep and A. F. Schauffler, Dr. Dorchester in his "Religious Progress," J. L. Jones, of Dublin, Behm and Wagner in London, as also the *Statesman's Year Book* of London. At the Pan-Presbyterian Congress, held in 1885, in Belfast, an American speaker—Dr. Pomeroy—declared that had Roman Catholicism advanced in proportion to the growth of the population, the 6,000,000 of this communion in the United States ought to be 18,000,000; and that the system was for America "a damage and a disquiet more than a danger."

It should be remembered that these statistics are as a rule those collected by the State authorities, in which religious preferences or antagonisms had no voice. But Roman Catholic authors themselves cannot close their eyes to these "disagreeable" facts. In an article in the *Quarterly Review*, January, 1888, the author, a Protestant, not only claims that the relative retrogression of Roman Catholicism is a leading phenomenon of modern religious life not confined to England, and can be observed over the whole world as the result and Nemesis of the dearly purchased victory of Jesuitic Ultramontaniam in that church; but he also cites Roman Catholic authors in confirmation of his claims. Abbé Roca and F. Curei both demonstrate the correctness of this proposition—the former in his book "Le Christ le Pape et la Démocratie" (Paris, 1884); the latter in his work entitled "Nuova Italia ed. Vecchi Zelanti" (Florence, 1881) and in the "Vaticano Regio" (Florence, 1883). Both of these authors analyze especially the religious status of the intensely Roman Catholic countries of South America, France, Italy, Spain, Austro-Hungary, Bulgaria, and, on the other hand, the United States. Everywhere the Latin Church has sunk deeply; thousands are turning to other churches. From their Catholic standpoints, both authors hope that the movement is only temporary in character, and that a reform in the administrative policy of the Vatican will

remedy matters without touching the traditional doctrines of the Church.

Does England too share in this general trend and tendency? From the claims of the Roman Catholic authorities and the tacit admission of many Protestants this would seem not to be the case; but rather that the Romanization of the British Isles is only a question of time. Attention is repeatedly called to the stirring activity of the Roman hierarchy, restored in England in 1851 under Cardinal Wiseman; to the successes in Scotland, where, notwithstanding the small proportion of Roman Catholics twelve years ago, there are now six bishoprics; to the propaganda and shrewd political measures of the convert Manning, who as the head of Anglo-Romanism has the highest of aims and the wildest ambitions; to the political and social regeneration of English Catholics since the Emancipation and the Reform bills of 1829 and 1832; to the great secessions in the fourth and fifth decade of this century, and to the Catholic tendencies of the State clergy shown by this movement; to the successes of recent propaganda among the nobility; and finally to the marvellous increase in churches and chapels, orders and brotherhoods, cloisters and priests. The old Catholics and the newly converted nobility (Norfolk, Butè, Ripon, and others), we are told, are more than willing to devote their immense wealth for the purposes of the Church; and the vigorous strength of the recent converts is striking the State Church of England, feeling secure in her legal and traditional rights on the one side, and the Catholicizing tendencies of ritualism is endangering her existence on the other: both Germany and France, too, have been drawn upon in late years for men and influence to control the Protestantism of England. All along the line, it is confidently asserted, the Jesuits, both those in the ranks of the converts, as also those who have come from abroad, have taken up the battle, and only the blind are not able to see on which banner this victory will be perched. Prominent voices within the Catholic fold are again and again reiterating these prophecies. The *Germania*, of Berlin, probably the ablest Catholic political daily published, claims that the noblest and best educated among the English are returning to the Church of Rome. The papal organ in Rome, the *Osservatore Romano*, confidently predicts a speedy subjection of the chief stronghold of Protestantism. Zanardetti sees in the dying Protestantism of England the departed daughter of Jairus, but in the

Roman Church the awakened youth of Nain. Abbé Martin, in the *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1878, declares that the Protestantism of England is intellectually dying, just as he claims it is already dead in both France and Germany. As early as 1860, Cardinal Manning said, "The Protestantism of England is dead—dead to the quick." Of course this last-mentioned voice of woe must be received *cum grano salis*; for the same Manning, only a few years before, on the occasion of the Third Provincial Council, held in 1859 in London, declared England to be the "head of Protestantism; the citadel of its strength." He declared that if Protestantism should be weakened in England it would easily be overthrown elsewhere; but England, regained for the faith, would be the Gospel teacher of the world. Only a few years later, when he had become a convert, he declared this same England to be no longer a "battle field, but a harvest field" for the Roman Catholic Church!

What are the facts of the case? These, and not rhetorical flourishes, must decide the question. There can be no doubt that, compared with the progress of the Catholic Church in earlier periods, this communion has socially and ecclesiastically made rapid advances in late decades. In the days of Elizabeth, Romanism in England seemed to be drawing its last breath. Between 1598 and 1688 the only representative of the hierarchy was an archpriest and apostolic vicar. In 1688 four vicarates were established—namely, London, Midland, Northern and Western Districts; in 1840 four more were added, namely, York, Lancaster, Welsh and Eastern District. Upon this basis Pius IX., in 1850, re-established the hierarchy. But few authentic documentary data are extant as to the numerical status of the Church at different periods. In 1596 there were 250 Roman Catholic priests in England; in 1608 there were 500; in 1636 there were 780. A report sent in 1635 by the Legate Panzani to the Pope states that of the 4,500,000 people in England, there were 150,000 Roman Catholics—*e.g.*, three and one third per cent of the entire population. Owing to the fanaticism of Charles II. and James II., which increased the hatred of Romanism and revived the old national cry of "No popery," this number in 1699 had decreased to 27,969, or one half of one per cent; and in 1745, according to reports sent the Propaganda in Rome, the four districts in England included only 58,635 Catholics, with 332 priests. In 1780 this number had already increased to 69,400, or

about one per cent of the population; and when in 1792 there was a large exodus of Catholics from France, this number increased rapidly, so that in 1804 a single district—the Northern—reported more than 59,000 Catholics. In 1814 London reported 49,800. But the inner development was seriously hampered by the fact that the Church was the object of the bitter hatred that had grown steadily since the days of the Armada and the Guy Fawkes conspiracy; and the proposition of Sir George Saville, who in 1778 proposed the removal of the political disabilities of the Roman Catholics—at least in some of their worst features—was answered by the terrible Gordon riots. Since the beginning of the present century matters have radically changed in this regard.

In accordance with this changed condition, the status of the Church, numerically, socially, and otherwise, has shown at least a noteworthy growth. In the years 1850 to 1888 the number of bishops in England and Wales increased from 8 to 17; the priests from 826 to 2314; the religious houses from 17 to 587; the pupils in church schools from 24,000 to 280,000; the churches from 507 to 1304. In Scotland, which formerly had no bishop and only a handful of priests and a few chapels, there were in 1888 already 6 archbishops and bishops, 334 priests, 327 churches, and 46 religious houses. These data are taken from the *Quarterly Review* of 1888, p. 31. Dr. Schleicher, in the *Allgemeine Konservative Monatsschrift*, July, 1887, gives about the same figures. According to this statistician, in 1780 there were 200 chapels in England; in 1824 there were 346; in 1841 there were 400, together with 17 cloisters and 557 priests; in 1853 the figures were 616 chapels and churches, 88 cloisters, and 875 priests; in 1881 it was 810 churches and 1620 priests; in 1877 it was 1095 churches and 1892 priests; in 1884 it was 1259 churches, 29 seminaries, and 2198 priests.

What are the causes of this growth? Is it the result of inner strength or of a happy combination of outward circumstances? The way was prepared and the movement advanced by a series of parliamentary measures, which were occasioned by peculiar phases of political and religious thought. The Emancipation and Reform bills of 1829 and 1832 relieved the Catholic Church of a heavy burden; the Oxford movement made the attempt to prove the connection between the Protestant churches of England and the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, and in the years 1841-45 led about 400 of the

clergy of the  
of laymen  
high mora  
these conv  
and deep  
could attr  
it was imp  
John Her  
force cou  
ridiculous  
factor, he  
Anglo-Ro  
1846-47 in  
gration of  
land. At  
and in t  
charity o  
Never be  
land suffe  
able to fl  
did so.  
England  
ca. Liv  
Sheffield  
thronged  
grants.

This  
growth i  
land. I  
land dec  
sus of  
there w  
who hac  
says Ray  
in the  
Society  
were in  
tion fro  
97,710  
of Irela  
cent of  
immigr  
childre  
usually  
very pr  
at leas  
to the  
to a m  
of Rom  
growth  
solutel  
church  
in Ire  
crease  
Just h  
of the  
vexed  
gration  
durin  
Esp  
this c



clergy of the Established Church and a host of laymen into the Roman fold; and the high moral and intellectual character of these converts awakened a widely spread and deep respect for a religious system which could attract such men and thinkers. For it was impossible to imagine that men like John Henry Newman and R. J. Wilberforce could submit to a system in itself ridiculous and silly. The most important factor, however, in the rapid growth of Anglo-Romanism was the famine years of 1846-47 in Ireland, and the resultant immigration of Irish Roman Catholics into England. At that time men died on the streets and in their houses of hunger before the charity of England could reach them. Never before, not even in 1741, had Ireland suffered as it did then. Whoever was able to flee from the famine-stricken land did so. Hundreds of thousands went to England and Scotland, and many to America. Liverpool, and Glasgow, Chester and Sheffield, and afterward London were thronged with the multitudes of immigrants.

This movement effected an immense growth in the Roman Catholicism of England. From 1846-81 the population of Ireland decreased about 3,500,000. The census of 1881 showed that in Great Britain there were no fewer than 781,119 persons who had been born in Ireland. Of these, says Ravenstein, in the "Law of Migration," in the "Journal of the Royal Statistical Society," June, 1889, p. 247, fully 562,374 were in England alone, while the immigration from Great Britain to Ireland was only 97,710 from 1871-81, so that the absolute loss of Ireland was 689,400 persons, or 12.7 per cent of the entire population. Add to this immigration of the Irish into England the children born in England—since Irishmen usually marry young, and Irish families are very prolific—it is fair to say that since 1841 at least 250,000 to 300,000 must be added to the figures given above. The Irish almost to a man are Catholics, so that the growth of Roman Catholicism in England is not a growth of the Roman Catholic Church absolutely, but only relatively. *What this church has gained in England she has lost in Ireland. The figures have not been increased; they have only been transferred.* Just here is the source of the cardinal error of the Roman Catholic statisticians on this vexed question; and the fact of this immigration, as also the growth of Protestantism during this period, are entirely ignored.

Especially interesting and suggestive in this connection are the data furnished by a

Catholic writer in the journal *Month*, July, 1885, in an article entitled "The Conversion of England." According to this writer, the Roman Catholic population of England and Wales in 1841 was 800,000; the total population 18,845,424; in 1885 the latter was 30,537,275—i.e., an increase of 62 per cent. Had the Roman Catholic Church increased proportionally, it would, in 1885, have had an increase of 496,000. Not counting in the increase from the Irish immigration or the English secession or those gained by the propaganda, the Catholic Church ought then to have numbered 1,296,000 souls. As has been seen, the Roman Catholic immigration since 1845 was more than 1,000,000 souls; so that the Church ought to have had 2,396,000 souls. In reality, however, the number in 1885 was 1,362,760, and, according to the *Catholic Directory* for 1887, only 1,354,000. *This means that the Roman Catholic Church in England has in round numbers lost one million souls in these years.* That the decrease has not been greater is not caused by any intrinsic strength of that Church, but solely to a chain of local and other outward causes, chiefly the Celtic immigration.

The official organ of the English Roman Catholic hierarchy, the *Tablet*, in its issue of May 21st, 1887, openly confesses that "the annual losses of Anglo-Romanism vastly exceed its gains." This, undoubtedly, is correct, although the two authorities cited disagree as to the causes. According to the *Tablet*, the losses are caused in the ranks of the children, not through the workings of the new "School Board" system, but through the splendid organization of the Protestant propaganda (?), which, it is claimed, bribes the parents and coaxes away the children, so that the Protestant schools and institutes are overcrowded with Roman Catholic children, who are thus withdrawn from the influence of their own church.

The fact of the retrogression of the Roman Catholic Church in England is thus not denied. The data furnished on this subject in the *Month*, of July, 1885, had not, as that journal expressly states in its issue of October, 1886, been called in question by any one, although they had been significantly ignored all along the line of Catholic discussion. Gladstone remarks on the inherent power of Romanism in an article in the *British Quarterly Review*, 1879, that of the 25 parts into which one could divide the population of England and Wales, one part is Romish and 24 anti-Romish; and the one Romish part consists

of at least 75 per cent Irish. Thus in the consciousness of the English people fully 96 per cent is anti-Romish. This judgment as to the relative power of Roman Catholicism as a factor and force in the public life of Great Britain expressed by a man who has studied the problem for many years, as Gladstone has, speaks volumes. And Gladstone's judgment is confirmed by no less an authority than Cardinal Manning himself. His own official calendar, the *Directory*, already cited, is evidence sufficient that the Romeward movement in England has come to a standstill. The following table tells its own story :

	Year.	Archbishops and Bishops.	Priests.	Churches and Stations.
England and Wales...	1888 1889	17 15	2,314 2,380	1,304 1,306
Increase or decrease		- 2	+ 66	+ 2
Scotland.....	1888 1889	6 5	334 341	327 324
Increase or decrease		- 1	+ 7	- 3

In a note it is especially remarked that in the list of priests, the invalids, superannuated, and others not in active service, as also a number of priests banished from other countries, have been included. In comparison with these data, the Protestant denominations show a remarkable growth in Great Britain, with the sole exception of the Quakers and the Unitarians, a total increase from 15.5 per cent in 1861 to 24.4 per cent in 1881, while Rome lags in the rear.

The same Archbishop of Westminster must furnish other telling evidences of this retrogression of his church. His *Directory* for 1888 gave the Catholic contingent in England and Wales as 1,354,000 ; for 1889 only 1,360,000—i.e., an increase of only 6000 souls, and even these figures stand in no relation to the Catholic immigration from Ireland, France, Italy, and other countries ; while compared with the increase of the population it shows proportionally a large loss of Roman Catholics. For during the last six years the annual increase in the population has been about 380,000, or 1.5 per cent ; the increase in the Roman Catholic ranks in 1887-88 was just a little more than 0.5 per cent, or nearly one per cent less than the increase in the population. To keep up with the latter, the growth of the Church ought to have been 18,280 souls, and not 6000. And without the Irish contingent the decrease would even be

greater. Similar data are secured from the statistics of marriages in England. These data naturally would favor the Catholics, since it is the habit of the Church not to report as Catholic those marriages performed by the non-Catholic clergy or by the Registrar-General. According to the *Statistical Reports*, there were, in the year 1845, before the Irish immigration, 1.95 per cent of marriages out of the whole number ; after the immigration this at once rose to 3.68 per cent ; in 1853, the year when the papal aggressions caused the Protestant panic in England, it was 5.09 per cent ; in 1865 it was 4.71 per cent ; in 1874 only 4.04 per cent ; in 1875, after the adoption of the Public Worship Regulation Bill, it again rose to 4.25 per cent, but in 1885 it went back to 4.13 per cent. Of the 197,745 marriages, 139,913 were performed by the clergy of the Established Church, and only 8162 by the Roman Catholic priests. The fact that fifty years ago the Roman Catholics constituted one third of the population, as they did in the days of Elizabeth, and have now decreased to one seventh, is no longer denied by Roman Catholics. According to the Catholic Year Book of Manning, the United Kingdom, in a population of 37,232,824, in 1889, the Catholic contingent numbered 5,600,000—i.e., a little more than one seventh. This is not progress, but loss.

These statistics receive a renewed confirmation and elucidation from other data, which show that internally and in the life of the nation the Roman Catholic Church is proportionally not even the power, factor, and force to which its numerical strength would entitle it. Socially and politically it is not proportionally of prominence in the State and the public life of the nation. Of the 620 members of the English aristocracy, there are 40 Roman Catholic members, instead of 90, as could be expected, and of these 27 are old Catholic families and 13 are converts. Of the 495 members of the Lower House, there are only 5 Catholics ; among 79 from Scotland, not one. Of the 16 members constituting the Queen's Cabinet, there is but one Catholic. Of the 204 members constituting the Privy Council of Her Majesty, there are only 9 Catholics, whereas the ratio expected is 30. Figures like these can be cited in abundance. It is indeed true that grand Catholic cathedrals have been erected in late years, and many colleges and schools founded. But what does this signify, when, as a rule, these buildings are under mortgage from turret to foundation stone, and the attendance at the schools is so small ? There are Catholic

colleges in  
ance does  
fessor.

On t  
crimes te  
of this cl  
Catholics  
the popu  
cent of L  
not prof  
the cred  
tablished  
Roman C  
is from 1  
50. In  
the fema  
fession w  
as all th  
same fac  
land, and  
the Cath  
the popu  
cent of  
1873-86  
prisons  
cent of  
herence

ON TI

From T

It is  
terest th  
cutta a  
of Chris  
the Oxfo  
upon th  
of Brit  
should  
guished  
Professo  
fessor \*  
the foll  
terest a  
other a

It is  
there i  
Old Tes  
xviii., x  
he has  
posed  
sian ru  
howeve

\* India  
(Calcutta  
Bond Stre

colleges in England in which the attendance does not average two pupils to a professor.

On the other hand, the statistics of crimes tell a doleful story of the influence of this church. While in 1888 the Roman Catholics constituted 4.13 per cent out of the population of England and 3.90 per cent of London, and although all criminals not professing any religion are entered to the credit, or rather discredit of the Established Church, yet the percentage of Roman Catholic prisoners in most localities is from 15 to 20 and 40, and at places even 50. In two of the larger cities of England the female prisoners of Roman Catholic profession were more than three times as large as all the other females combined. The same facts are observable in Canada, Ireland, and elsewhere. In Ontario, although the Catholics constitute only 16 per cent of the population, yet they furnish 59.22 per cent of the criminals; in Toronto from 1873-86 the Catholic contingent in the prisons was 34.66 per cent, and 35.77 per cent of the female prisoners professed adherence to this church.

## ON THE ANCIENT BELIEFS IN A FUTURE STATE.

BY W. E. GLADSTONE.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), October, 1891.

It is a circumstance of real literary interest that there should be published in Calcutta a periodical devoted to the promotion of Christian learning, under the auspices of the Oxford Mission to India, and depending upon the contributions of Native as well as of British writers; and further, that it should attract the support of so distinguished a Hebraist and Biblical scholar as Professor Cheyne. An article by this Professor\* furnishes the point of departure for the following remarks upon a subject of interest alike in itself and in its relation to other and yet wider subjects.

It is the opinion of Professor Cheyne that there is a doctrine of immortality in the Old Testament. He finds it in Psalms xvi., xvii., xxxvi., xlix., lxiii., lxxiii. He thinks he has proved that these Psalms were composed "during the latter part of the Persian rule over Palestine." In the Review, however, he does not enter upon the date of

these Psalms: but states a principle which serves as a convenient text for a discussion of the subject touched by it. The principle is this\* :—

It involves a much greater strain upon faith to hold that the wonderful intuition of immortality was granted so early as the times of David and Solomon, than to bring the Psalms in question down to the late Persian age.

The general doctrine which appears to be here conveyed is to something like the following effect: that the human race advances through experience, heredity, and tradition, from infancy toward maturity; that the mind, subjected to these educative agencies, undergoes a process of expansion, and becomes capable in a later age of accepting intelligently what in an earlier age it could not have been fit to receive. In my opinion such a doctrine requires an important qualification; because moral elements, as well as those which are intellectual, go to form our capability of profitable reception, and because it depends upon the due proportion and combination of the two whether an advance in the understanding shall or shall not bring us nearer to the truth. But, for the sake of argument, let the doctrine stand. If it stands, it sustains a presumption that knowledge with respect to a future life, after once being imparted, improved in the early stages of human history with the lapse of time. But, as yet, the doctrine rests only on the footing of an argument *a priori*. From this there actually lies an appeal to the argument derivable from positive testimony. Does our information with regard to the religions of the ancients lead us to believe that the sense of a future world advanced, or that it receded, as "the years rolled into the centuries," and as civilization assumed more positive and consolidated forms? Be it remembered all along that the question before us is not whether the knowledge of a future state was evolved by man subjectively from his own thoughts, or was divinely imparted. The present question is only whether, when once received, this particular article of religious knowledge progressively advanced along with the general growth of intelligence, or whether, on the contrary, it declined.

I am not willing, however, to quit altogether this question of presumption *a priori* without drawing an inference in parallel subject matter, which appears to me relevant, and rather strong.

If the advance of civilization imported

\* *Indian Church Quarterly Review*, April 1891, No. 2, p. 127. (Calcutta: Oxford Mission Press; London: Masters, 78 New Bond Street.)

\* *Indian Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1891, No. 2; p. 128.

the growth of intelligence, and if the advance of intelligence quickened the mental eye for the perception of things beyond the material range, this quickening, it is obvious, would be available, not for the future only, but for the unseen world at large, both as to a standing consciousness of its existence, and as to a readiness to acknowledge and accept the presence on earth, and in human affairs, of any beings by whom it is supposed to be peopled.

It is intelligible, indeed, that a distinction may be drawn between a belief in Providence, and a belief in Theophany, or in the marvellous under any of its many forms. Let us accept this distinction. It will still, I apprehend, remain undeniable that the onward movement of ancient civilization did not in practice enliven, but rather, on the contrary, tended to weaken or efface the belief in the doctrine of Providence; in an unseen but constant superintendence and direction of human affairs by the Divine power. I take Homer and Herodotos as two men who, while separated in time by a number of centuries even greater than the four which the historian allows, were both of them, according to the lights and opportunities of their day, pious men. But how far stronger, more familiar, and more vivid, is the sense of a Providence truly divine, of the *theos* and *theoi* quite apart from polytheistic limitations, in Homer than in Herodotos. Take another step, say of half a century, from Herodotos to Thucydides; and you encounter a work of history generally as perfect in its manipulation as the highest productions of Phidias; but a work, also, the author of which had lost all touch of the religious idea, and could hardly be said to see, what even Agnosticism thinks it sees, the fact of a mighty or an almighty power working behind an impenetrable curtain. Well: during the interval of time between Homer and Thucydides the progress of Greece in civilization had been immense; but she had lost her grasp of the doctrine of Providence, of the nearness of deity to man, of its living care for human affairs and interests. And whatever may be said of the speculations of Plato, an intellect more muscular, more comprehensive, and more entirely Greek—the intellect of Aristotle—places the element of deity at a distance from human life as wide as that of the Lucretian heaven. This was not, evidently, because of a decline in intellectual capacity. But the aggregate of the influences operative upon human perception had enfeebled the sense of the unseen *present*. The presumption, though (thus far) no

more than a presumption, herewith arises that it would also enfeeble the sense of the unknown future.

Now let us pass on to the direct evidence available upon the subject before us: and I will recite at once the conclusions which the facts, as far as we know them, seem to me to recommend. They are as follows:—

1. That the movement of ideas between the time of civilization in its cradle, and the time of civilization in its full-grown stature, on the subject of future retribution, if not of a future existence generally, was a retrograde, and not a forward, movement.

2. That there is reason, outside the Psalter, to think that the Old Testament implies the belief in a future state, as a belief accepted among the Hebrews; although it in no way formed an element of the Mosaic usages, and cannot be said to be prominent even in the Psalms.

3. That the conservation of the truth concerning a future state does not appear to have constituted a specific element in the divine commission intrusted to the Hebrew race, and that it is open to consideration, whether more was done for the maintenance of this truth in certain of the Gentile religions.

As regards the first of these propositions, which is one of fact only, we seem to labor under this great difficulty, that the Greek or Olympian religion is the only religion of antiquity which we can trace at all minutely in its different phases through the literature and records of the country; whereas it is by no means a religion which distinctively enshrines the doctrine of a future state. In the case of Assyria, while we might hope for testimony extending over a lengthened period, the destiny of mankind after death did not, according to Canon Rawlinson, occupy a prominent place in the beliefs of the people.\* And if we turn to the Egyptian, and the Iranian or Persian religions, the means of comparing their earlier with their later states seem to be very incomplete though not wholly insignificant. The Persian religion in its earlier condition was one of a dualism of abstract conceptions, and it progressively developed them into rival personalities. In the course of time, the country came under the influence of Magianism. To the early Zoroastrianism, there had been attached a strong belief in a future state of a retributive character. But when Herodotus wrote his account of the Persian religion he described the Magian system and its ele-

\* *Ancient Religions*, p. 77.

† *Herod.* i. 131, 138; iii. 16.

mental w  
little or  
scheme, u  
it reject  
The older  
be the rel  
the people  
had lost g  
and pant  
far no sig  
future st  
it was pa  
The hi  
Greece a  
portant  
large nu  
tote him  
religion  
ander f  
probably  
ligion, t  
most im  
Plutarch  
Dr. Ha  
one of t  
pompos  
state.  
this doc  
of Zoro  
The p  
Egyptia  
portant  
notices  
In the  
ondary  
from th  
doctrin  
the are  
to be  
should  
such as  
religion  
partly  
Egypt  
knowle  
tween  
devote  
and Bo  
princip  
of refe  
lief in  
althou  
shall a  
Egypt  
The  
in the  
of his

\* Raw  
+ Esar  
of the P  
Dr. Wes  
P. 9



mental worship, and seems to have known little or nothing of the older Persian scheme, unless on the negative side, where it rejected temples, images, and altars. The older form had now apparently come to be the religion of the Court, rather than of the people.\* The religion of abstract ideas had lost ground; that which was sacerdotal and pantheistic had gained it. I see thus far no sign of progress in the doctrine of a future state. The inference rather is that it was passing into the shade.

The historical relations, however, between Greece and the Persian empire were so important that, probably on this account, a large number of the Greek writers, Aristotle himself included, gave attention to the religion of the great antagonist whom Alexander finally overthrew. It was, most probably, the later condition of that religion, to which their accounts relate. The most important of them, from Herodotos to Plutarch, are textually cited or described in Dr. Haug's *Essays on the Parsees*.† No one of them, except that ascribed to Theopompus,‡ makes any reference to the future state. We shall see presently what a place this doctrine occupied in the earlier times of Zoroastrianism.

The political relations of Greece with the Egyptian empire appear to have been important in the prehistoric period; but the notices of them are few and undetermined. In the great literary age, they were of secondary concern. It has become well known, from the monuments, how powerfully the doctrine of the future life was developed in the archaic religion of Egypt. It was not to be expected that the classical period should here supply us with information such as it has furnished with respect to the religion of Persia. But Herodotos was led, partly by the peculiarities of the case of Egypt generally, and partly from his acknowledging a certain early connection between its religion and that of Greece, to devote more than forty sections of his second Book to his account of it.§ Yet that principal account does not contain one word of reference to future retribution, or of belief in the existence of the soul after death; although in another portion of his work we shall see that he mentions the primitive Egyptian teaching.

The fifteenth Satire of Juvenal censures in the strongest terms the Egyptian religion of his own day, at once debased and fanati-

cal. He then closes the satire in an ethical strain of remarkable loftiness; and it might be thought that, had future retribution been a living and prominent portion of the Egyptian religion of his day, he could hardly have avoided making some reference to it, especially as he appears to have been himself a believer in the unseen world.\* But in the *Isis et Osiris* of Plutarch, I find a passage which, if I understand it rightly, signifies that the Egyptian priests of his time had become somewhat ashamed of the old definite, circumstantial teaching of their religion concerning Osiris,† as the judge of each dead man and lord of the Underworld, in that it savored too much of matter, or was in some way behind the age. Again, Iamblichus, writing in the age of Constantine, and discussing the Egyptian religion, assigns to it a high rank, but does not seem to include the idea of a future state among its motive powers.‡ Thus, then, the doctrine of the future state, if viewed as a working portion of religion, lost force and did not gain it with the lapse of time under the Egyptian system, which had been so famous for its early inculcation.

Undoubtedly this seems to have been the case also with the Greeks. The genius of that extraordinary people does not appear at any time to have qualified or inclined them to adopt with anything like earnestness or force that belief, which is so marked in the religions of Egypt and of Persia at an early date. Homer is here our principal authority: and what we gather from the *Odyssey* is that the Underworld of the Poet is evidently an exotic and imported conception, made up of elements which were chiefly supplied from the religions of Egypt and Assyria. We may also observe that the place he finds for it lies in the outer zone of his geography, beyond the great encircling River Okeanos. In the *Iliad*, the great national and patriotic poem of Homer, the doctrine of the future life appears only in the case of Patroklos, and there only as a vague, remote, and shadowy image. The Egyptian name for the kingdom of the dead was Amenti, which seems to reappear in the Greek Rhadamanthos. There is a singular circumstance associated with one of the discoveries of Schliemann at Mycenæ. In a tomb fifteen feet six inches in length, and only five feet six inches in breadth, the bodies of full-grown men are laid not along but across the space, being thus squeezed in the strangest manner. But they were in

\* Rawlinson's essay, in his *Herod.* I. 426-31.

† *Essays on the Sacred Literature, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees*, by Dr. Martin Haug. Edited and enlarged by Dr. West. (London, 1890.) Essay I. pp. 3-16.

‡ P. 9.

§ Vol. ii. 35-76.

\* Sat. ii. 149 sqq.

† *Plut. de Is.* c. 382. 37. ταῦτα, ὅπερ οἱ νῦν ἱερεῖς ἀφοσιούμενοι καὶ παρακαλυπτόμενοι μετ' εὐλαβείας ὑποβιβάζουσιν.

‡ Iamblichus de *Mysteriis*, 159 9. (Lugduni 1577.)

this way made to lie east and west, and toward the west: and such we learn was the position in which the Egyptians laid their dead.\* Minos is also introduced to us as a personage in the Underworld of the *Odyssey*, and he is engaged in administering justice. So far we follow the Egyptian idea. But the Greek spirit took the heart and life out of the realm of Osiris. Minos sits, so to speak, not as a criminal but as a civil judge: he does not punish the guilty for their misdeeds on earth, but simply meets the wants of a community for an arbitrator of determining authority in their affairs.† No one, whom we can certainly call a compatriot of Homer's, appears in the Underworld as under penal suffering: not, for instance, Aigisthos, or Klutaimnestra, who might have been fit subjects for it. In the ethical code of Homer, there is no clear recognition of penalty for sin; except it be for perjury upon the breach of great public pacts; and this penalty is made applicable to gods and men alike. The only case, in which he associates the existence after death with happiness, is that of Menelaos. Menelaos is among the purest characters of the Poems: but the reason given for his fortunate lot is, that he was the husband of Helen, and son-in-law of Zeus.‡ It is, however, plain that there must have been a general belief in a future state among his contemporaries, or we should not find it as we now find it embodied and developed in a poem essentially popular.

It was, then, an article of the national belief in the heroic age. What became of it in the classical period? It faded out of notice. There grew up instead of it that remarkable idea of the self-sufficiency of life, which became a basis for Greek existence. Apart from particular exceptions, and from the mysteries, which remained always only mysteries for the people, things temporal and things seen affixed all round a limit to human interests. The Underworld could not have been treated as it is treated by Aristophanes, in any country except one where for the mind of the people at large it had ceased to have a really religious existence. The disputed existence which it obtained in some of the philosophical schools is itself a witness to the fact that for man as such, in the wear and tear of centuries, the idea had not, upon the whole, gained ground, but lost it, among the most intellectual people ever known.

Have we not then to wait for the evidence which is to show that the doctrine of im-

mortality would have been too great a strain for the Hebrews at the reputed era of the composition of the Psalms under David and Solomon, and that it was mercifully withheld from primitive man who could only feed on milk, to be administered as strong meat to a later and more mature generation?

Even were such evidence to be forthcoming on behalf of the general proposition, we should still have to ask how it is known, or why it is to be believed, that the idea of immortality was made known to the Hebrews from Persian sources? The Captivity was not a Persian, but a Babylonian captivity. The advent of Persian power brought it to a close. It was Magianism, rather than Zoroastrianism, that the political influence of Persia at the time would have been likely to impart. But what proof is there, during the period which followed the return, and preceded the Greek supremacy, of this kind of Persian influence over the Hebrew People? The adoption of Persian words in the popular language was a general fruit of Persian power, and is said not to have included subjects of religion.\* But I pass on to the second of the three heads which have been proposed.

## II.

The six Psalms, indicated by Professor Cheyne as those in which the hope of immortality may perhaps be traced, all lie within the first, that is, speaking generally, the older portion of the Psalter. For those who suppose them to have belonged to the worship of Solomon's temple, and who are glad to follow Professor Cheyne when he proves that they embody the hope of a future life, it would be somewhat anomalous to believe that, while the public service taught this doctrine, no mark of it had been left, outside the Temple walls, upon the historical books of the Old Testament, or in the sense of the people. True, the doctrine of a future existence is not prominent upon the face of the older Scriptures. Neither, it might perhaps be said, is it very conspicuous in the speech and actions of the Pharisees in the Gospels, who notwithstanding are known to have held it. But yet we should expect to find some traces of it: and our Lord has actually taught us that it is conveyed in the declaration that God was the God of Abraham and of Isaac and Jacob; a saying of which the force can hardly be escaped by the plea that He was interpreting ancient lore in conformity with the current opinion of the people.

\* Schliemann's *Mycenæ*, xxxii. iii. and 295.

† *Odyssey*, xi. 568-71.

‡ *Ibid.* iv. 569.

• Haug, p. 5.

In the  
vised, Ven  
words,

And En  
for God to

The rend  
pleased G  
God trans  
natural s  
Hebrew i  
and it a  
various T  
to put an  
cept one  
Septuagi  
in the u  
cepted be  
by those  
the sense  
16 and  
given by  
Bible, by  
Bishop I  
by Gro  
*Critic*  
ther this  
not seem  
only add  
cording  
in the  
from the  
tion as  
owe its  
There  
spread,  
cient tin  
istence  
untrue  
and tw  
that the  
by Mos  
public  
ments,  
certain  
the ind  
viving  
this day  
Warbur  
been 1  
for whi  
ble. W  
would  
as it w  
a futur  
commi  
this fu  
gather  
main

\* Bish  
† In to

In the Authorized, and also in the Revised, Version of Gen. v. 24, we read the words,

And Enoch walked with God : and he was not ; for God took him.

The rendering of the Septuagint is that he pleased God, and that he was not found, for God transposed or transplanted him. The natural sense of the words taken from the Hebrew is the necessary sense of the Greek : and it appears that it is adopted by the various Targums.\* Is it possible rationally to put any interpretation on this verse, except one which conveys the idea just as the Septuagint has put it, and shows that life in the unseen world was a conception accepted both by the author of the verse, and by those for whom it was written ? Such is the sense given to it in Ecclesiasticus xlv. 16 and in Heb. xi. 5. Such is the sense given by Bishop Browne in the Speaker's Bible, by Fuller in the Student's Bible, by Bishop Patrick adopted into Mant's Bible, by Grotius, Fagius, and others† in the *Critici Sacri*. But I will not pursue further this enumeration in a case which does not seem to leave room for doubt. I will only add that the legend of Ganymede, according to the beautiful form which it bears in the *Iliad*,‡ with just so much of descent from the loftiness of the old Hebrew tradition as we might have expected, seems to owe its origin to the translation of Enoch.

There seems to subsist a vague, but widespread, impression that the Hebrews of ancient times were not made aware of the existence after death. In the direction of this untrue notion, two concessions I believe, and two only, can be made. The first is, that the future state is nowhere proclaimed by Moses. The second, that a national and public dispensation of rewards and punishments, purely temporal, may have had a certain tendency to throw into the shade in the individual mind the doctrine of our surviving corporal dissolution. And, for us of this day, it is possible that the argument of Warburton in the *Divine Legation* may have been made instrumental to consequences for which its author is not really responsible. What he argued was, that Moses never would have promulgated his system, devoid as it was of sanctions from the doctrine of a future state, unless he had been divinely commissioned and inspired. But around this fair and probable argument there has gathered a varied group of errors, with this main one at the head, that the religion

taught by Moses was the entire religion of the patriarchs and of the ancient Hebrew nation ; or that at the least it was, as a religion, an advance upon the patriarchal religion, a kind of halfway house between it and Christianity, so that to look beyond it for any truths of Hebrew belief, which it does not contain, is to recede from the light into the darkness.

There are, indeed, delivered by Moses certain broad enunciations of principle, which appertain to the habitual religion of the individual and may truly be called spiritual commandments. In part, the injunctions of the Decalogue have this character ; but they do not seem to mark the point of loftiest elevation reached by the declarations of Moses. The principle of love is not expressly contained (unless as to parents only) in the ten precepts ; although room, so to speak, is made for it to occupy, by the exclusion of false gods, by the re-injunction of the sabbatical rest—for it may, after the Assyrian discoveries,\* with increased confidence be described as a revival—and by the negatives so rigorously put upon crime and appetite. But may it not be said that those negative forms, and that revival of the sabbath, of themselves point to something higher ? The acme of the declarations of Moses appears to be reached first in Leviticus (xix. 18), where it is proclaimed that a man is to love his neighbor as he loves himself ; and further, in Deuteronomy (vi. 5), that he is to love the Lord *his* God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his strength. These injunctions fill the space left open by the Decalogue. Is there any reason for regarding them as novelties, first taught from or after Sinai ? It is easy indeed to comprehend the appropriate wisdom of their solemn republication after the children of Israel had so long dwelt in the midst of a corrupt idolatry, and so far as we know without the advantage either of a fixed code or of positive institutions,† to cherish and keep alive the truths which their fathers had possessed. True, these great principles of religion are nowhere taught in the Book of Genesis as precepts ; but neither is belief in God, nor any other part of the religion of the patriarchs, set out in a creed or a code. We only see it live and work : and are not these great principles of love to God and man the very same principles, which made Enoch too good to remain

\* Smith, *Assyrian Discoveries*, p. 12.

† It is at any rate remarkable that the reason given for the release of the children of Israel from Egypt is (Exod. vii. 16 ; viii. 20) that they may serve God in the wilderness ; and again it appears, from Exod. viii. 20-23, that they could not perform the proper sacrifices to God in Egypt, but must go into the wilderness for the purpose.

\* Bishop Browne, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, in loc.

† In loco by each of these respectively. ‡ *Iliad*, xx. 332-5.

under the conditions of an earthly life, and which fashioned the faultless character of Joseph?

The Mosaic law was neither the full enunciation of a personal religion for individuals, nor an instrument for educating a nation into counsels of perfection. In truth, it dealt with the nation rather than with its component members, and laid down precepts for each of these only in so far as it was necessary to maintain them as a community separated from the rest, to testify against idolatry by the worship of one God, to exhibit through its ritual and sacrificial system the character of sin, to cherish the expectation of a coming deliverance, and in the meantime, and until the fulness of time should come, to gird about an encircled space. "a vineyard in a very fruitful hill;"\* within which a spiritual worship, and the lives befitting it, might have full and unhindered growth upon the basis traditionally known to the fathers of the race.

But it may without difficulty be shown that, while the Mosaic law was a law of temporal sanctions only, the people did not fall so low, in the scale either of nature or of grace, as to suppose that the life of man is at an end when his remains are laid in the ground: that they did not sink so far beneath the other nations of remote antiquity, none of which appear to have entertained that dishonoring and dangerous belief, though they varied from others in the prominence which their systems assigned to the positive doctrine on the subject. It might perhaps be sufficient to cite the care taken and cost incurred by them in the sepulture of the dead, as proofs that when burial was accomplished they did not think all was over. But more pointed proofs are not deficient. Let us take, for instance, the case of the prophet Elijah. In his lifetime, he must have been a character as conspicuous as the sovereigns of the country; while, after his death, it appears that a living tradition of his greatness made him the special type of the prophetic office, both in the mouth of Malachi, and when four more centuries had elapsed at the Transfiguration of our Saviour.† It will not, I suppose, be disputed, that the Hebrews received as true the history of his being corporally transported into heaven: an occurrence, which we are specially informed that fifty men of the sons of the prophets stood to witness from a distance, while Elijah and Elisha passed over Jordan together.‡ Is it possible that a people, who believed this prophet

had thus been carried up from earth, believed also that with that miraculous transportation his existence came to an end?

Still more remarkable, upon the point now before us, is the proof of the popular belief afforded by the practice of necromancy among the people. The whole basis of such a practice lies in an established popular conviction that the spirits of the departed not only existed, but existed in a state of susceptible faculty, and might be moved, by influences exercised in this world, to make apparition before the eyes of the living. It appears, indeed, that this practice was viewed by the governing powers with jealousy, for the woman, who had "the familiar spirit," urged, when application was made to her, that it was dangerous for her to comply, because Saul had "cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizard out of the land."\* Under such circumstances, as the prohibitions of the Mosaic law were no dead letter, the profession of the witch could only be kept alive by strong inducements; and what strong inducement could there be, except a curiosity of the people for direct information about the dead, which involved the certainty of their continuing existence?

King Saul finds himself placed in desperate straits by the attack of the Philistine army, at the time when David was serving in its ranks. Samuel, the mainstay of the State, had recently died, and had been solemnly mourned for by the people. Saul was driven, in order to obtain the benefit of indispensable counsel, to seek the aid of those whom he had attempted to extirpate. Failing to obtain light upon the emergency by any of the ordinary means, he requires his servants to find for him a woman with a familiar spirit. He is referred to such a person, who lives at Endor. He repairs to her in disguise, evidently believing that, though she would of course regard the king as her enemy, yet, if he could pass for one of the people, she would meet his desire, and evoke the spirit of the dead in the regular way of business. She recognizes the king, and he has to give her a promise of indemnity. Samuel is then brought up; and a scene is reported to have taken place, in which his spirit addresses King Saul, and, in the exercise of the gift of prophecy, announces that his kingdom was to depart from him. Such is the narrative, which would appear to imply the reality of the apparition. Both the rabbinical commentators, however, and the Christian writers,

\* Isaiah, v. 1. † Malachi iv. 2; Mark ix. 4. ‡ 2 Kings ii. 7.

\* 1 Sam. xxviii. 4, 9.

are divided  
present c  
apart fr  
simply r  
generall  
extending  
The me  
pression  
may hav  
stringen  
tained i  
not exp  
dead, bu  
cluded f  
sion; a  
the pro  
popular  
after de  
tinuity  
of Mose  
• It is  
belief v  
operativ  
from S  
ment of  
the cas  
stand a  
were pr  
the Psa  
of a fu  
portion  
of sain  
ideas o  
istence  
have a  
osition  
time of  
the H  
in the  
that,  
power  
eviden  
any ve  
period  
have a  
tem of  
worke  
legible  
after  
some  
mind  
the p  
it wh  
cal d  
been  
futur  
seem

\* See  
and of  
Bible.  
English  
+ Ex



are divided upon this question down to the present day.\* But this is a matter wholly apart from the present argument, which simply rests upon the fact that there was a general belief in such apparitions, a belief extending even to the king upon the throne. The measures taken by Saul for the suppression of necromancy and all witchcraft, may have been adopted in obedience to the stringent and repeated prohibitions contained in the law.† Those prohibitions do not expressly name intercourse with the dead, but this, I apprehend, cannot be excluded from the general scope of the profession; and, if so, the number and nature of the prohibitions is a fresh testimony to the popular belief in the existence of the soul after death, and seems to indicate its continuity among the Israelites from the time of Moses onward.

\* It is not now the question how far this belief was developed, or how far it was operative on conduct. We have no proof from Scripture that it implied the punishment of bad men in the other world, though the cases of Enoch and Elijah may fairly stand as indicating the rewards of those who were pre-eminently good. Neither again in the Psalms is the penal part of the doctrine of a future life as plainly discernible, as the portion which concerns the rest and peace of saints. As we see from Homer, the ideas of future retribution and of future existence have not a necessary, though they have an appropriate, connection. My proposition amounts simply to this: that, as in the time of our Lord, so in the pre-exilic periods, the Hebrew race in general did not believe in the extinction of the soul at death: and that, as to the completeness and moral power of this belief, we do not seem to have evidence requiring or entitling us to draw any very broad distinction in favor of one period as against another. Thus much I have admitted: that, as the theocratic system of Moses, aided by the order of prophets, worked in the earlier time in a manner more legible, so to speak, by the people, than after the exile, and as this may have tended somewhat to confine or weaken the habit of mind which resorts to future sanctions, so the post-exilic period, or that large part of it which was passed in a condition of political dependence, may to some extent have been favorable to a more active sense of the future life. But nowhere does a necessity seem to arise for supposing that the Jews

received any large infusion of positive doctrine on the subject of a future state from the circumstances of the Babylonish captivity, or from Persian influences after its close.

### III.

If, then, it is admitted, even by those who favor the argument followed in these pages, that the doctrine of a future state nowhere entered into the prescriptions of the Mosaic law, and is not directly declared and inculcated in the earliest Scriptures, it probably subsisted among the Hebrews rather as a private opinion, than as an obligatory belief. And it obviously follows that it did not form a part of those truths, or of that system, which the Jewish people were appointed to maintain and to transmit. It was not divinely intrusted to them, as part and parcel of their special work. Was there, then, any other, even if it were an indeterminate, provision among the nations for the conservation of this belief?

Undoubtedly, in this wayward world of ours, truth commonly has error on its borders, and in the neighborhood of religious beliefs, in themselves just and weighty, there may lie all round a set of opinions, more or less openly avowed, which, if associated with them at all in the order of thought, are no better than their spurious offspring. Thus, from the Christian point of view, it was a great fact of religion that, long before the Advent, and indeed from the outset of human history, God had selected a portion or portions of the human race for high and special purposes to which He perceived their adaptation. From the call of Abraham onward, we perceive that great and wonderful selection of his posterity, which proclaims itself to the world down to this very day. But upon such a positive truth men have allowed themselves to graft the negative assertion, that the rest of mankind were outcasts, without any sign of the Divine favor, or of possessing a share in the designs of the Almighty for the education of mankind.

It is likely that this misconception may have been extended and strengthened by the great movement of the sixteenth century. That movement threw the mind of the reformed communities upon Scripture, as a bulwark of defence against the ruling authorities of the Latin Church; and this not upon the New Testament only, which records the final breaking down of the wall of severance, but upon Scripture as a whole; so that, especially within the energetic sweep of Scottish Presbyterianism, and of

\* See Grotius, Munterus, and others, in the *Critici Sacri*; and of recent commentators, Adam Clarke, the Speaker's Bible, the Student's Bible, Mant, and Thomas Scott. Modern English commentators for the most part affirm the reality.

† Exodus xxii. 18; Levit. xix. 21, xxx. 6; Deut. xviii. 10.

Puritanism in England, the Old Testament was lifted more nearly to a level with the New. In details the Old Testament itself testifies, by hundreds of passages, to the active providential relation with persons and races outside the confines of the Abrahamic race and the Mosaic dispensation. The dealing with Melchisedec, the marriage of Joseph to the daughter of the priest of On,\* and of Moses to the daughter of the priest of Midian,† the assignment of portions of country in the promised land to Canaanites, the remarkable history of Balaam, the beautiful episode of Ruth the Moabitess, the explicit language of the Psalms, and of the prophets, among whom Jonah had no other mission than to Nineveh—all these circumstances, which might be stated with very wide development, ought to have made the enlarged knowledge of Scripture a guarantee against narrow conceptions. But the resort to the sacred volume was of necessity in a great degree polemical; and the polemical frame of mind, however effective for its immediate purposes, however inevitable in the case before us, is too commonly fatal to enlargement and impartiality of view. The notion of a race preferred over other races, and employed in a particular case to administer punishment for depravity, was magnified into an absolutely exclusive love, and a not less sweeping condemnation or neglect.

It was a breaking of new ground when, in 1815, there was published an essay of Bishop Horsley's which treats of Messianic prophecy and of various portions of truth preserved among the heathen. Among these were included the immortality of the soul; and the Bishop, in anticipation of researches to come, makes reference to the sacred books of Persia.‡

It has been, indeed, the belief of the Christian Church and community, that the history not only of the chosen people but of the world throughout a very wide circle was, before the coming of our Lord, a grand *preparatio evangelica*. In some respects, the forms of this preliminary discipline were obvious enough. The conquests of Alexander secured for that marvellous instrument of thought, the Greek language, such a currency as, when backed by the influence which in the West had been acquired by its literary monuments, dispensed as it were with the day of Pentecost in the general action of the Christian Church, and supplied a channel of communication and a

vehicle of worship available in most parts of the civilized world. What the genius of Greece was to secure in the region of thought, the vast extension of the Roman empire effected in the world of outward fact. It prepared the way of the Lord and made the rough places plain. Immediately before and after the advent, it levelled the barriers between separate and hostile communities, and for the first time established the idea of police in its highest form, and made peaceable and safe intercourse everywhere possible among men. Everywhere it was, as with us in Britain: "when the Roman left us," then it was that again "the ways were filled with rapine."\*

Another stage on the way to the comprehension of a truth of the widest reach and highest value was attained, when the world began to be sensible of its debt to ancient Greece. It may well be, to us of this day, a marvel to conceive how it could have been that, down to a time when poetry and the arts had already achieved the most splendid progress, the Christian world remained insensible to the superlative dignity and value of the ancient Greek literature and art. In Italy at least, the compositions of the Greeks must all along have survived in numerous manuscripts. But the Greeks had not merely produced a certain number, not after all a very large one, of great works of mind and hand: they had established habits of mind and of performance, alike in art, in letters, and in philosophy, such that they furnished the norm for civilized man in the ages to come. Hellenism became a capital fact for the race. Greece supplied the intellectual factor under the new dispensation of Christianity, as truly as the Hebrew race supplied us with the spiritual force which was to regenerate the heart and will of man. And this was done for millions, who knew little but the name either of Greeks or Jews. And if this transcendent function was assigned to the Hellenic race, outside the bounds of any continuing revelation, the question surely arises whether other races may, through their forms of religion or otherwise, have made their special contributions to the fulfilment of the grand design for establishing the religion of the Cross, and for giving it an ascendancy which is already beyond dispute, and which may be destined even to become, in the course of time, universal over the surface of the earth.

The last, and in a much higher degree the present, centuries have opened the door to

\* Gen. xiv. 18: xlii. 50.

† Ex. ii. 21.

‡ *A Dissertation on the Prophecies of the Messiah dispersed among the Heathen*, pp. 16, 115. The essay, which was posthumous, is wider than its title.

\* Tennyson's *Guinevere*.

a knowledge wholly without precedent of these ancient religions, which took and long held their place in conjunction with advanced civilization and commanding political power. I suppose that Sir William Jones and Anquetil du Perron will be forever famous among the pioneers in this great undertaking, the one for his services with regard to the Vedic, and the other to the Zoroastrian religion. Besides the vast subsequent progress in the spheres of knowledge there opened, the interpretation of the Egyptian and the Assyrian monuments has effected nothing less than a revolution with regard to the archaic religions of the earliest great empires of the world. It is of the deepest interest to examine whether in any and what particulars, now recognized by Christians as undoubted portions of revealed truth, those religions were more advanced or more enlarged than the religion of the favored race. The question is hardly one entangled with controversy. No doubt, if it be found that these extraneous and independent religions taught in any point more fully than the Hebrews what Christians now acknowledge, this will be for Christians a new and striking proof that in the infancy of the race of Adam, and before its distribution over the earth, the Almighty imparted to it precious knowledge, which it could hardly have discovered, and was but indifferently able to retain. But those, who view religions as simply the formations gradually effected by our own unaided powers, from fetichism upward, will have their solution ready also: the diversities of the onward movement, as between one race and another, will for them only show variety in tastes and in capacity for progress. Let me proceed to an example.

It is a favorite observation with the negative writers on religion, that the narrative of the temptation in the Garden of Eden lends no support to the doctrine of the existence of Satan or of devils, inasmuch as the seduction of Eve from obedience is ascribed simply to the serpent. The personal action of the evil spirit is mentioned in several places of the Old Testament. But there is no identification of him with the serpent of Paradise; and further, there is no distinct intimation that he came to be what he was through a rebellion against God followed by a fall from heaven. The magnificent description by Isaiah\* of the fall of Lucifer from above, though it may well serve for a description of such a rebellion, is primarily referable to the king of Baby-

lon. It is only passages of the New Testament, and these not systematically combined in its text, which inform us that he was a fallen spirit, once in conflict with the servants of the Most High. We hear nothing, in fact, from the Old Testament of the War in heaven. But while this awful tradition was waiting for its sanction from the pens of Apostles, and was apparently unknown to the Hebrews, there was sufficient recollection of it in the heathen religions. We are told of it as late as by Horace.\* Homer gives it us in various forms—of the Titans punished in Tartaros,† of the Giants,‡ and perhaps also in the attempt of Otos and Ephialtes to scale the heavens.§ Still, we had not until recently had easy means of carrying the tradition further back into remote antiquity. But the Assyrian monuments, though as yet but partially unveiled, furnish a tablet,|| thought by Mr. Smith to be one of those about which Berosus states that they were buried before the Deluge, and disinterred after it had subsided. This tablet contains the story of the seven wicked gods or spirits, who conspired together to make war against Hea. And Hea sends his son Merodach to put them down, even as Horace in his fine ode assigns to Apollo a capital share in quelling the attack of the Giants.¶ Probably much more evidence could be collected to the same effect. But what has been said is sufficient as an instance in support of my general proposition, namely, there may be cases where the independent religions of antiquity have enshrined in very pointed forms traditions justly to be called primeval, which have obtained no clear notice in the Old Testament, but which subsequently appear as authorized portions of the New. If this be true, then it is surely also true that these religions were employed *pro tanto* in the counsels of Divine Providence, for purposes reaching beyond and above the consciousness of those who proclaimed and practised them.

Let us now proceed to take a somewhat higher flight. It will be admitted on all hands that the doctrine of a life beyond the grave is an article essential, to speak moderately, for the completeness of religion. Locke, in his famous Essay, excluded from toleration those who did not believe in a future state, because without such belief, as he held, they could give no sufficient guarantee for their conduct as good citizens.

\* Hor. *Od.* b. iii. 1: v. 49.† *Iliad*, x. 429.‡ Hom. *Od.* vii. 59, 206.§ *Ibid.* xi. 307.|| G. Smith's *Assyrian Discoveries*, pp. 398-402.¶ Hor. *Od.* iii. iv. 60-4.

\* Isaiah xiv. 4-19.

No one perhaps would act upon such an opinion now. There is a law written in our nature itself, apart both from temporal sanctions and from the prolongation of existence after death, which of itself imposes upon sound minds a real obligation to good conduct. But there are several things which may be fairly urged. First, all men have not sound minds; and secondly, that the doctrine of a future life not only harmonizes with, but very greatly strengthens that obligation. And moreover, that any power, which society now possesses to dispense with this powerful sanction, and yet enjoy comparative impunity, is largely due to an elevation in the social standard of right and wrong, both public and private, due to the long reign of Christianity in the manners, policy, and belief of civilized man.

We have seen that the doctrine of a future life was not among the sanctions of the Mosaic law. It is not necessary for my purpose to endeavor to track it through all the non-Mosaic religions of antiquity. It will be enough to dwell upon two of them, in which it appears to have attained, at a very early date, a remarkable development. And it is noteworthy that, while the recipients of special religious light in prehistoric times were Semites, neither of these cases is found among members of that family: the one being Aryan or Japhetic, and the other what is commonly called Turanian. They are respectively the cases of Iranians or Persians, and of Egypt. And there is a certain amount of resemblance between the two forms of development, which tends to favor the presumption of a common origin.

The "strain to faith," which Professor Cheyne regards as unsuited to an early stage in the existence of the race, seems to have been put upon the Egyptians and the Iranians at a very early stage indeed. Perhaps the case of Egypt carries us nearer to the fountainhead of historic time by its certified antiquity. But the date of Zarathustra, or, according to the Latin corruption of the name, Zoroaster, is thrown back by many beyond the reputed age even of the Egyptian remains. The modern Parsees bring him down to about 550 B.C.; but Drs. Haug and West point out that the movement, which he led, is noticed in the earlier Vedas, and conceive it not unreasonable to place him as a contemporary of Moses.

The great work of Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, published in 1837-41, made us familiar with the belief of the Egyptians, not only in a future life, but in a life of future retribution. Their funerals seem to have been celebrated with the utmost pomp of relig-

ious rites.\* It is a well-known and at least plausible opinion, that the skilled preservation of the mummy was intended to conserve the remains in a condition fit for renewed occupation by their former owner. On the Monuments, a procession of boats cross, from Thebes, the Lake of the Dead, and at the necropolis the body is set up in the ancestral sepulchre. The final judgment is held before Osiris, no sinecurist like Aidenus in Homer, but the real working sovereign of the Underworld and its inhabitants; who governs as well as rules. Before him justice was administered, without the law's delay: administered there and then. The actions of the dead man were weighed in the scales of Truth, and recorded by Thoth.† Horos then conducted him into the presence of Osiris, Anubis also taking a share, and the four Genii of Amenti waiting to do their part. It was not dread of disgrace, says Wilkinson,‡ which the Egyptians were taught to look upon as the principal inducement to virtue, but the fear of that final judgment, which awaited them in a future state, and which was to deal with their omissions as well as with their crimes. The all-scrutinizing eye of the Deity penetrated into the secrets of the heart; and, as the rewards of the good were beyond conception, so were the punishments of the bad, who were doomed to a transmigration into the forms of the most detested animals. The evidence of their belief is to be found amply recorded upon the oldest among their monuments.§ In later times, the features of ritual and presentation were perhaps less strongly impressed upon the masses, but the tenet continued to be acknowledged by the Egyptians, and it seems sufficiently clear that from them the doctrine of immortality was learned by Pythagoras and Plato.||

Let us now turn to the testimony, perhaps less remarkable, of the Zoroastrian religion. In the person of its great teacher, it was mainly based, says Haug, on Monotheism,¶ although the *motor*, or evil principle, was present with that of good in Ahuramazda, or Ormuzd, himself.\*\* He taught a future life which was to succeed the present one: nor did he hold survival only, but retribution, and likewise the resurrection of the body.†† On the third night after death, the soul of the dead man approaches the bridge of Chinvat (or assembling), and is contended for by Deities on one side, and

\* *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, by Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, Second Series, vol. iii. plates 83-8.

† Wilkinson, *ibid.* ix.-xi.    ‡ *Ibid.* ii. 438.    § *Ibid.* i. 211.

¶ Wilkinson in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, at ii. 123.

\*\* Haug, p. 301.

\*\* P. 303.

†† Pp. 217, 511-13.

Devas  
by Or  
flesh.  
with a  
of th

But  
terror  
spirits  
into t  
dwell

Th  
doctr  
thoug  
tion,  
ritual  
it on  
ly e  
mon  
belie  
place  
relig  
ished  
prac  
long  
be d  
we  
char  
men  
sent  
bro  
per  
him  
pro  
onc  
wh  
Th  
"I  
ma  
but  
you  
fro

mo  
Th  
ter  
gre  
Fi  
lu  
po  
m  
lik  
th  
M  
hi  
to

Vo  
p.  
re  
th



Devas on the other, while he is examined by Ormuzd himself as to his conduct in the flesh. The pure soul passes the bridge, with a company of its fellows, and an escort of the blessed ones, into heaven.

But the souls, which come to the bridge full of terror and sick, find no friend there: the evil spirits, Vizaresha by name, lead them bound down into the place of the dead; into the darkness, the dwelling of the Druj.\*

Thus the Persian religion had a developed doctrine of immortality, like that of Egypt; though they were shut out by their rejection, in the early stages, of imagery and ritual from using those means of stamping it on the general mind, which were so freely employed by the Egyptians on their monuments. Nor can we doubt that the belief in immortality continued to hold its place in the authoritative standards of the religion, for we understand that it is cherished by the Parsees at the present day as a practical tenet. Whether it had not lapsed long ago from its position of influence may be doubtful. At any rate, a passage which we find in Herodotos seems to suggest a change of that character under the Achaemenid sovereigns of Persia. Cambyzes, absent from his capital, had put to death his brother Smerdis. The murdered man was personated by an impostor, who proclaimed himself king, and sent a herald to make the proclamation in the camp. Cambyzes at once challenged on the subject the person whom he had sent to commit the murder. This was Prexaspes, who replied by saying, "If the dead rise again, then indeed you may expect also to meet Astyages the Mede; but if things continue as they have been, you need have no anticipation of trouble from that quarter."†

Prexaspes spoke with the object of removing alarm from the mind of the king. This speech indicates a decline; and deterioration had also been manifested in other great articles of the religion of Zoroaster. First, it had been developed into an absolute dualism.‡ Each of the two contending powers was surrounded with a council of six members, over which he simply presided, like a moderator in a presbytery. Under the sacerdotal and ritualistic system of the Magi, as Duncker§ assures us, Ormuzd himself was represented as offering sacrifices to Mithra and others; actual images of the

deities were fashioned under the first Artaxerxes;\* and Artaxerxes II., falsifying the account of Herodotos,† erected a temple, as well as statues, to Anakita at Ecbatana.‡

To conclude. Both the conservation of the belief through so many centuries, and the immense force with which it seems to have acted on the public mind at the earliest epochs, stand in singular contrast, as to this great article, with the Mosaic system: nor do I see how we can refuse to recognize a sublime agency for the preservation of truth in the one case, as well as in the other. The God of revelation is the God of nature. The means employed may be different, but the aim is the same. And when the Redeemer, standing in Judea, brings life and immortality fully into light, He propounds a doctrine already not without venerable witness in the conscience and tradition of mankind.

#### DR. SCHÜRER ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.§

BY REV. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., DEAN IRELAND'S PROFESSOR OF EXEGESIS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, OXFORD, ENGLAND.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), October, 1891.

WHEN the Editor kindly offered me the opportunity of replying to Dr. Schürer's article, it happened that I was already engaged upon it—not indeed directly, because I had not then seen the *Contemporary Review*, but in a form in which the greater part of the substance of it had previously appeared in Germany. Two years ago a little volume was published at Giessen ¶ containing two lectures, one of which was by Dr. Schürer on the "Present Position of the Johannine Question." Anything of Dr. Schürer's would at any time have attracted my attention, but this did so particularly, not only from the candor and fair-mindedness by which it was distinguished, but also from the fact that it anticipated a thought and purpose of my own. The leading idea which ran through it was the approach which the two sides in the critical controversy had of late been making toward each other; and I too had been struck by this, and had been hoping to take it in like manner as a starting-point in a

\* Duncker, *History of Antiquity*, b. ii. ch. vii.; from the *Vendidad*.

† Herod. iii. 62, misquoted, as I conceive, by Duncker (vol. v. p. 181, Abbott's translation). The text runs: *εἰ μὲν νῦν οἱ θεοὶ περὶ ἀνθρώπων . . . εἰ δ' ἔστι νόμος πρὸ τοῦ, κ.τ.λ.* I note the tone and spirit, as well as the words.

‡ Hang, p. 305.

§ Book vii. ch. vii. Abbott's translation, p. 161 of vol. v.

\* Book vii. ch. vii. Abbott's translation, p. 176 of vol. v. † *Ibid.* p. 177.

‡ Herod. i. 131.

¶ Dr. Schürer's article was reprinted in the previous number of this MAGAZINE.

¶ "Vorträge der Theologischen Konferenz zu Giessen."

V. Folge. Giessen, 1889.

survey of the critical situation. At the end of last term I announced for October a course of University lectures on this subject, which are likely afterward to appear in print. It may be thought, therefore, to be superfluous that I should offer these remarks in advance upon the paper, but several reasons have determined me to do so.

In the first place, I must confess to being a little disappointed with the paper in its English dress. It does not seem to read so judiciously as it did; additions and alterations have been made in it, which have their value, but which seem to have given to it somewhat more of a cast of advocacy; it is (or at least it appears) less sympathetic toward the conservative position, and one who adopts that position feels himself more put upon his defence. At the same time the *Contemporary Review* reaches a wide public, and one which is not likely to concern itself with what I may have to say elsewhere. But there are points in Dr. Schürer's article which I should be sorry to see pass unchallenged. And much as I think it marks a real advance on the critical side, and gladly as I welcome it as a step toward an ultimate understanding, I should be sorry for it to be thought that the position is exactly as it is described.

It will not, however, be expected that I should enter fully into the arguments by which Dr. Schürer supports his case. For that I must refer to the fuller statement which I am making elsewhere. It is not to be supposed that questions of this magnitude can be thrashed out in the pages of a magazine. I do not understand that Dr. Schürer himself is of that opinion; but he has indicated with great clearness the broad lines of the controversy. He has taken I think a greater step than has yet been taken toward narrowing down its issues. And I cannot but think that it will be a still further gain if he is met frankly from the opposite camp, and if some one, who the present writer only wishes was rather more representative than himself, would say how far his proffered terms can be accepted. Dr. Schürer comes with an olive-branch, and I, too, would meet him with an olive-branch. A little mutual discussion may clear the ground for further parleys.

I fear that at the outset I cannot take to heart his comforting assurances that the question of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is not one which need affect the faith of a Christian. That faith rests upon what Jesus Christ really was, and not only upon what the Church has supposed Him to be. But the question of the authorship of the

Fourth Gospel is important chiefly from its bearing upon the character of the evidence as to what He was. So far as that evidence is imperfect or untrustworthy, our faith will rest upon insufficient grounds.

It is not, then, a question which can be entered upon with a light heart, or one in which merely academic or literary issues are involved. It is wholly different from the question as to whether there are one or two or more Isaiahs, or what may be the date of some of the Psalms:

"Non levia aut ludicra petuntur  
Præmia, sed Fidei de vita et sanguine certant."

Of course it is a satisfaction to find that Dr. Schürer can surrender the Fourth Gospel without surrendering anything fundamental with it. I would not willingly place a stumbling-block in the way of those who are able to go with him. I am only afraid that I cannot count myself among the number. However, I do not say this with a view to evade the critical problem. On this ground at least Dr. Schürer and I are at one. I quite admit that a critical problem must be solved by critical methods—methods, that is, that are really critical; and if our sense of the interests at stake makes us scrutinize those methods closely, and perhaps even jealously, this should be only a wholesome guarantee of soundness and care in their application. Far better to wait a while before a conclusion is reached, than reach it on hastily gathered and imperfectly tested data.

By no means the least valuable part of Dr. Schürer's essay is the historical sketch of the course of criticism. It was a happy thought to mark off the periods by the names of Bretschneider (1820), Baur (1844-1847), and Keim (1867). The characterization of each period is also, I think, skilfully given. The list of more recent opponents of the Gospel is, however, I suspect, less imposing than it looks. Of Thoma, Dr. Schürer has formed a sufficient estimate, though there are occasional good things among much extravagance. Pfleiderer will do his reputation no credit by the few pages which he has devoted to the Fourth Gospel in his "*Urchristenthum*" (pp. 776-786). But Pfleiderer the critic is a different person from Pfleiderer the historian of doctrine, and by no means entitled to the same consideration. Immer's "*Neuest. Theologie*" is quite a second-rate piece of work. Oscar Holtzmann disarms criticism by his modest preface. Perhaps it was this and his name which secured for him what I cannot but think a too complimentary notice in

the "T  
a differ  
cousin,  
but thi  
trious  
It is si  
he has  
almost  
vincing  
Epistle  
is not  
The m  
Gospel  
negati  
" Apo  
comes  
struct  
a mas  
quarte  
even  
Gospo  
I of  
Schür  
strict  
of a  
("G  
reth,  
and  
d. vi  
Paul  
gelie  
schic  
All  
case  
favo  
they  
oppo  
orig  
whic  
seen  
wou  
that  
wou  
logu  
doe  
by  
tha  
he  
Pay  
Joh  
ber  
ing  
sta  
gol  
Th  
of  
on  
th  
—  
"i

the "Theologische Literaturzeitung." Of a different calibre, no doubt, is his elder cousin, Dr. H. J. Holtzmann of Strassburg; but this most acute, widely read, and industrious scholar is addicted to hypercriticism. It is significant of his mental attitude that he has succeeded in convincing himself, and almost, as it would seem, succeeded in convincing Mangold as well, that the First Epistle which bears the name of St. John is not by the same author as the Gospel.\* The most striking treatment of the Fourth Gospel with which I am acquainted on the negative side is that by Weizsäcker in his "Apostolisches Zeitalter" (1886). Here it comes in as part of a broadly planned constructive argument, which is developed in a masterly manner. I am stating in another quarter my own reasons for thinking that even the view thus presented of the Fourth Gospel is untenable.

I observe that the English version of Dr. Schürer's article has not been brought quite strictly down to date. No mention is made of a group of writings by Dr. Hugo Delff ("Geschichte des Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth," 1889; "Das vierte Evangelium," and "Neue Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung d. vierten Evangeliums," 1890), or of Dr. Paul Ewald's "Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage" (1890), or of Nösgen's "Geschichte d. neuest. Offenbarung" (1891). All these (with some qualification in the case of Dr. Delff) are on the same side, in favor of the Gospel; and in point of ability they will well bear comparison with their opponents. Dr. Delff is independent and original almost to a fault; but the theory which he puts forward, strange as it may seem, has rather more to be said for it than would appear at first sight. He believes that the Gospel has been interpolated (he would cut out the greater part of the prologue and the Galilean sections), and he does not think that the Gospel was written by the son of Zebedee. But he does think that it was written by an eye-witness, whom he identifies with John, the Presbyter of Papias and Eusebius. He holds that this John was a native of Jerusalem and a member of one of the high-priestly families, taking quite literally and making much of the statement by Polycrates, that he wore the golden plate (πέταλον) of the high priest.† There are certain points about the Gospel of which Dr. Delff has laid a vigorous hold; one is its essentially Jewish character, and the extent to which its statements may be

illustrated out of the Talmud; and the other is the insight which the author shows into the temper and aims of the upper classes in Jerusalem. His book is full of shrewd remarks, it is fair to add, cutting both ways, for he is a perfectly free lance in criticism. I need hardly say that I do not think that the interpolation theory will stand; but the book is one which will have to be reckoned with. Dr. Paul Ewald is another wielder of a vigorous pen, and a staunch defender of the Gospel as it stands. He does not treat the whole subject, but he has, I think, shown reason to believe that the characteristic ideas of the Fourth Gospel had a wider diffusion in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic ages than they had been supposed to have, and that it is not legitimate to follow the Synoptic type merely to the exclusion of them. After all, that type represents, not the general consciousness of the Church, but the particular tradition embodied in the two leading documents, the Mark Gospel and the Matthean Logia. Again, I do not think that all Dr. P. Ewald's materials will hold good; but there is a sufficient residuum to establish his point, and this, too, will have to be reckoned with. Nösgen represents a more old-fashioned and stricter conservatism. I cannot say that I find his close-packed volume easy or attractive reading; but it deserves the recognition which is due to painstaking and conscientious work.

In regard to our English criticism, Dr. Schürer, I think, has been a little misled in supposing that the discussion of external evidence so much preponderates over that of internal. So far as it may seem to do so, this is due to the impulse given to that side of the controversy by the work entitled "Supernatural Religion." If Dr. Schürer will take up any of the recent commentaries on the Gospel, especially those by Dr. Westcott and Dr. H. R. Reynolds, or the "Introduction" by Dr. Salmon, he will see that the external evidence has no larger place than is its due.\*

Twenty years ago, in a youthful work of my own, I excused myself for treating only of the internal evidence on grounds very similar to those alleged by Dr. Schürer.

"The subject of the external evidence has been pretty well fought out. The opposing parties are probably as near to an agreement as they are likely to be. It will hardly be an unfair statement of

\* "Jahrb. f. prot. Theol." 1882, p. 128 ff.; Bleek-Mangold, "Einleitung," p. 769.

† Eus. H. E. iii. 31, 3.

\* Dr. Westcott gives to it about 44 pages of his "Prolegomena," which extend in all to 97; Dr. Reynolds assigns to it 25 pages out of 161; Dr. Salmon treats the whole group of Johannine writings together, and his discussion of the external evidence is less easy to separate, but he goes thoroughly into the internal evidence, and the same might be said of Dr. Plummer and Archdeacon Watkins.

the case for those who reject the Johannine authorship of the Gospel to say that the external evidence is compatible with that supposition; and on the other hand we may equally say for those who accept the Johannine authorship that the external evidence would not be sufficient alone to prove it.\*

When this was written I do not think that I was prepared for quite so great an extension of the evidence as has since taken place. I am at present disposed to rate the argument from external evidence rather higher. Of course "prove" is a large word, and it would certainly be too much to say that the genuineness of the Gospel was "proved" by the external evidence. Still, I believe that it is distinctly favorable to the genuineness. Several points I am willing to concede to Dr. Schürer in the summary which he has added to the English version of his paper. (1) I think that English criticism has taken too little account of the so-called Alogi. Not that their dissent is of much real importance; it appears to have been based upon doctrinal or critical and not upon historical grounds, and it does not at all imply the existence of a continuous tradition adverse to the Gospel. Still, it is an exception to the general *consensus*, and so far forth it shows that toward the end of the third quarter of the second century the Canon of the Gospels had not reached the same degree of fixedness in some localities that it had in others. (2) I attach but little weight to the now unequivocal testimony of the Clementine Homilies, because of the uncertainty of their date. It was the Tübingen critics who laid stress upon them first, and the same stress has continued to be laid upon them longer than was necessary. (3) But, on the other hand, the recovery of the "Diatessaron" is a fact of real importance. Tatian's "Diatessaron" and Heracleon's "Commentary" together are significant of the estimate in which the Gospel was held between Justin and Irenæus, and are more than a valid set-off against the Alogi. There is really a very strong phalanx of testimony from this period. (4) I take note of Dr. Schürer's admission, which is no more than right, in regard to Justin; but I think that it is too readily assumed that the fewer allusions to this Gospel are due to any doubt as to its authority. Tatian alone would be presumptive evidence against any such doubt. But how many other causes might account for this slighter notice! Justin's Christianity can hardly have been

of many years' standing when he wrote. The Gospels probably did not all reach him at once; he would use most those which came to him first and pre-occupied his memory. At least one great Johannine conception—that of the Logos—exercised a very considerable influence over him. But Justin not only had the Gospel; he had it, I suspect, with more than one marked corruption already in its text (John i. 13, iii. 3, 5, and possibly ix. 1\*), proving that it was no newly circulated work. More of this elsewhere. (4) I am surprised to see Dr. Schürer repeat an argument which has so often been exploded as that about Papias. I would commend to him the decisive discussion of it in Bishop Lightfoot's "Essays on Supernatural Religion." It would be much truer to say that the evidence of Papias and Polycarp to the First Epistle is evidence also to the Gospel. And Bishop Lightfoot† gave a reason, which is not without some weight, for believing that Papias had a knowledge of the Gospel. (5) The tendency in England among very dispassionate theologians is to think that Basilides himself, and not merely his disciples, used the Gospel. So (inferentially) Dr. Hort:‡ so a paper recently read in Oxford by Dr. James Drummond; and so, too, the great American scholar, Dr. Ezra Abbot. I may add that Staehlin's theory about the Hippolytean account of Basilides, though suggested from this side the water, is finding but little favor among us. But if Basilides accepted the Gospel, where is the probability that it was composed in the second century?

On all these grounds I think that there is a clear balance of testimony in favor of the Gospel which cannot be put aside as if it did not exist. The composition of the Gospel is pushed back to a time very near that of the Apostle, and even the modified date (130 A.D.), which Dr. Schürer now believes to be the "latest" (p. 394), cannot, I think, be maintained.

But I am willing to allow that the main battle must be fought out on the internal evidence.

And here I am afraid that Dr. Schürer will think me rather grasping, for I must take all, or nearly all, the concessions which he gives me, and (with one exception) I have but little to offer him in return.

That he should make these concessions speaks well for his disinterestedness and openness of mind. But they are such as

\* "Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel," p. 3. London, 1872.

\* Cf. Resch, "Agrapha," p. 23 f.

† "Essays," p. 198 (see also pp. 32 ff., 184 ff.).

‡ Dictionary of Christian Biography, i. 271.

must ce  
fuller m  
hid, and  
run.

The  
disposed  
acceptin  
Dr. Sch  
well. I  
and a st  
much to  
(Nisan  
John's  
other.  
dence i  
"it m  
Johann  
probabl  
much  
allow t  
ride th  
that th  
ciled;  
that it  
version

Let  
point.  
either  
harmo  
that e  
free fr  
so let  
two al  
strong  
mutua  
sion to  
that t  
some  
cile th

In  
one w  
specia  
crucia  
Schür  
courts  
acted  
But a  
feast  
depen  
that  
on th  
that  
tion.  
phras  
eatin

\* "G  
Knobel  
chäftst  
werden  
dürfen  
Sabbat  
auch i  
Festa



must certainly be made, and that in still fuller measure, for truth cannot always lie hid, and it will assert itself in the long run.

The one point which Dr. Schürer seems disposed to give, and which I hesitate in accepting, is as to the day of the Crucifixion. Dr. Schürer sums up here very fairly and well. He quite sees that there is a case, and a strong case, on both sides. There is much to be said both for the Synoptic date (Nisan 15) on the one hand, and for St. John's date (apparently Nisan 14) on the other. Dr. Schürer admits that the evidence is evenly balanced, but thinks that "it must be distinctly granted that the Johannine narrative is internally the most probable." Twenty years ago I took very much this view myself. I was content to allow the Johannine version simply to override the other. To-day I am not so sure that the two narratives cannot be reconciled; and if they are reconciled I think that it must be on the basis of the Synoptic version, not the Johannine.

Let me not be misunderstood on this point. I do not wish for any wresting of either narrative simply in the interests of a harmony. I am not concerned to prove that either St. John or the Synoptics are free from error. If there is a real collision, so let it be. But in everyday life, when two alternatives are put before us—both strongly supported, and yet, as it seems, mutually excluding each other—the conclusion to which we come naturally would be that there was somewhere behind the scenes some unknown factor which would reconcile them, if we only knew it.

In the present instance the question is one which must be ultimately decided by specialists in Jewish antiquities. The crucial points, as it seems to me, are two. Schürer adduces evidence to show that no courts could be held and no business transacted on the first day of the Paschal feast. But all the passages cited relate, not to a feast day, but to the Sabbath, and therefore depend for their force upon the assumption that feast-day and Sabbath were precisely on the same footing. But it seems to me that Nösgen is right in calling this in question.\* The other point is, whether the phrase "eat the Passover" may refer to the eating of the *Chagigah*, and not to that of

the Paschal Lamb. I have in my mind Schürer's own monograph on the subject ("Ueber *φάγειν τὸ πάσχα*, Giessen, 1883). But a higher authority still on such a subject pronounces against him. Dr. Ederheim concludes a note written directly in view of Schürer's argument: "No competent Jewish archaeologist would care to deny that 'Pesach' may refer to the 'Chagigah,' while the motive assigned to the Sanhedrists by St. John implies that in this instance it must refer to this, and not to the Paschal Lamb."\* I am prepared to think, therefore, until better advised, that the narrative in St. John need not conflict with that in the Synoptics.

On the other points on which St. John either adds to or seems to correct the Synoptic narrative I have never had the slightest doubt, and I am glad that Dr. Schürer recognizes the excellence of the Johannine tradition. The qualification which he adds surely may be struck out. In a few expressions here and there, and possibly in portions of the narrative, the Fourth Gospel appears to be dependent on the Synoptics. I agree that this is the most probable explanation of coincidences like the two hundred *denarii* worth of bread (John vi. 7; Mark vi. 37), or the myrrh that might be sold for three hundred *denarii* (John xii. 5; Mark xiv. 5). It is not exactly a case of "borrowing," but the writer had seen the works of his predecessors, and his memory was quickened by what he read there. I do not think that he wrote with his predecessor's words actually before him; but if he had done so, and if he had copied them far more extensively than he has, I cannot understand how Dr. Schürer could write that "literary dependence on the Synoptics is very strange for an Apostle." There was a stage when such an argument might have been used, but that I should have thought was far past. Surely "literary dependence" of one writer upon another—great or small—is one of the very commonest phenomena all through the Bible from Genesis to Revelation.

It is a different matter when we come to the supposed want of progressiveness in St. John's presentation of the Messianic claim. Here there is a real ground for Dr. Schürer's objections, and he has stated them with much force. And yet he has not, I think, escaped the danger of writing as an advocate rather than as a judge. If he were writing as a judge, a good many facts would come into view which he has ignored, and

\* "Gesch. d. neutest. Offenb." i. 379. The reference to Knobel-Dillmann on Ex. xii. 16 runs as follows: "Die Geschäftsrufe braucht keine gänzliche zu sein; es darf gemacht werden, was gegessen wird von jehlicher Seele, d. h. die Speisen dürfen bereitet werden welche die Personen brauchen. Am Sabbath und Versöhnungstag war jedes Geschäft verboten, auch Feueranmachen, Kochen und Backen, an den andern Festtagen jedes Arbeitsgeschäft."

\* "Life and Times," &c. ii. 568 (fourth edition). See also the preceding note, p. 566 f.

his estimate of some of those which he has given would have been somewhat different.

I will, however, meet him at the outset by saying that I am prepared to make one large concession—that concession which, as he rightly says, marks the chief advance that conservative critics have now in very many instances made toward their opponents. I make it not merely from a wish to conciliate them, or to rescue the genuineness of the Gospel, but in the interests of what I conceive to be historically probable and true. In this respect I have no change to make from the position which I took up twenty years ago. To say that the Gospel was written by St. John is not to say that it is necessarily in all points an exact representation of the facts. It was written by the Apostle toward the end of a long life. But what should we expect under such circumstances? When an old man looks back over the past, one of the first things which he is apt to lose is the sense of perspective. End and beginning draw nearer together. The facts which belong to an earlier stage of development are seen in the light which is thrown upon them by a later stage, and this later interpretation affects the statement of them as history. I admit that St. John's narrative may have been influenced in this way. I am not prepared to say exactly how far it has been influenced, but some such influence seems to me to be in the nature of the case.

I cannot, however, allow that the narrative is by any means so unprogressive as it has been made out to be. Even Dr. Schürer does not seem to be able to get rid of our modern associations. Because we attach to the name "Messiah" a fully developed Christology, he seems to suppose that it must have attached to it from the first. It is true that Jesus of Nazareth is recognized as the Messiah by the first disciples who join Him. But what of that? There were a score Messiahs between the death of Herod and the fall of Jerusalem. Large sections of the people were keenly expectant of the Coming One, and were ready enough on slight evidence to greet and acknowledge Him. But these first hasty and vague recognitions were very different from the deliberate confession of St. Peter, when it was clear already that the common idea of the Messiah was not that which Jesus Himself entertained, or which He came to satisfy. The blessing which St. Peter called down upon himself was the blessing of those who saw this—saw at least something of this—and yet believed: "Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in Me!"

It was this test which perhaps we need not say proved too much for the Baptist, but seemed at a time of great and natural depression as if it might prove too much for him. There is not the smallest contradiction between the misgivings which arise in the Baptist's mind in his dungeon at Machaerus, and that high inspiration (as much above his ordinary level as the doubt was below it) with which he saluted Jesus when He came to his baptism. I am surprised that Dr. Schürer should acquiesce in such a shallow view of history as to suppose that there was any such contradiction, and that the question of St. John must needs be that of "one in whom the spark of faith is beginning to glimmer for the first time!" Our German friends have one fault: they are apt to think of men and women as if they were machines which have but one motion, and not creatures of flesh and blood, now obeying this impulse and now that.

I am surprised, too, at Dr. Schürer's next paragraph, which I feel sure that he would not have written in the "*Theologische Literaturzeitung*," or anywhere in which it appealed to a trained, and not to a popular audience. The expulsion of the buyers and sellers from the Temple is put forward as an act implying the highest prerogatives of the Messiah. Why so? It is precisely on the same footing with many of the acts of the Old Testament prophets; it might have been performed by Isaiah or Jeremiah, or Micaiah the son of Imlah, and very possibly would have been performed by them if they had had to deal with the same state of things.

When we look at all beneath the surface of the Johannine narrative there are many signs of the same reserve which we find in the Synoptics. After the feeding of the 5000 the crowds cannot restrain their enthusiasm; they try to take Jesus by force and make Him king (vi. 15); but He retires out of their way. A little later we find Him still in Galilee, and His brothers half-ironically urge Him to go up into Judea: "For no man doeth anything in secret, and himself seeketh to be known openly. If Thou doest these things, manifest Thyself to the world" (vii. 4). This is hardly consistent with a public and continuous proclamation of Messiahship. This state of things still lasts as late as the winter before the Passion. At the Feast of Dedication (*i.e.*, in December) we are told that the Jews came about Jesus and said to Him, "How long dost Thou hold us in suspense? If Thou art the Christ, tell us plainly!"

(x. 24).  
them "  
tinct a  
siahshi  
this pas  
part to  
veals a  
writer  
agrees  
questio  
viduals  
an assu  
that th  
all the  
fact; l  
clear a  
No, se  
When  
the di  
chapters  
We an  
would  
I susp  
made  
ment  
I woul  
of the  
can be  
tolic a  
happ  
the pr  
pende  
I fully  
ing in  
with v  
the te  
this is  
Dr. S  
H. H  
"Lel  
pariso  
the S  
of pr  
are f  
not o  
in W  
theor  
him  
point  
speci  
large  
also t  
ment  
put f  
than  
agrec  
ing i  
is th  
And  
for m  
Gosp

(x. 24). Clearly He had *not* hitherto told them "plainly." He had not made any distinct and explicit declaration of His Messiahship. I would venture to lay stress on this passage. It is the Johannine counterpart to the message of the Baptist, and reveals a consciousness on the part of the writer of the true state of things. It also agrees with the confused and whispered questionings of chapter vii., where individuals are still groping their way toward an assured belief; they have a suspicion that the Messiah is among them, and apply all the tests they know to ascertain the fact; but there does not appear to be any clear and direct issue, involving a Yes or No, set before them.

Whether all this is equally consistent with the discourses recorded in the previous chapters is more than I should like to say. We are apt to read into them more than would be read into them at the time. But I suspect that the Evangelist himself also made them more explicit in the announcement of Divinity. I have said already that I would not vouch for the literal accuracy of these discourses. Yet no valid argument can be drawn from that against their Apostolic authorship. It is just what must have happened unless the laws which regulate the processes of the human mind were suspended. The *foundation* of the discourses I fully believe to be genuine. There is nothing in them which is really inconsistent with what we know from other sources of the teaching of Jesus. For the proof that this is so I may appeal to a writer to whom Dr. Schürer will listen with respect. Dr. H. H. Wendt, in the recent volume of his "*Lehre Jesu*," after a most elaborate comparison of Johannine doctrine with that of the Synoptics, ends by drawing up a series of propositions, all of which he contends are fully confirmed from them. I would not of course pledge myself to every detail in Wendt's position; I do not believe in his theory of interpolations. I agree both with him and with Dr. Schürer that certain points are selected by the Evangelist for special emphasis which would not bulk so large in the actual teaching of Jesus; and also that there may be very possibly an element of *anticipation in time*, truths being put forward in the Gospel at an earlier date than that to which they really belonged. I agree also that there has been some recasting in the form of the discourses. But this is the furthest point to which I can go. And I see in all these points an argument for rather than against the view that the Gospel was written by St. John. A lesser

man, a man with faith less deep, a man less thoroughly imbued with the mind of Christ, would have been more timorous in his handling. The Evangelist writes from a serene height of full assurance and personal conviction, which it seems to me easiest to attribute to an Apostle of the Lord.

But are there other reasons for regarding the Gospel as the work of an Apostle? There are really overwhelming reasons, which may be seen amply stated by our English authors—Westcott, Salmon, Watkins, Plummer, Reynolds, Gloag; or by Continental scholars, such as Luthardt, Godet, Weiss, Beyschlag, Nösgen, Bleek, and a number of others. It is, I cannot but think, nothing less than morally certain that the author of the Gospel was a Jew of Palestine, and also in a high degree probable that he was a contemporary and eye-witness of the events which he records. The first proposition is proved by his intimate knowledge of Jewish topography, manners and customs, and modes of thought. It would be wearisome to repeat the lists of instances which have been accumulated in such profusion; but it should be enough to take up a work like Lightfoot's "*Horæ Hebraicæ*," or Wünsche's "*Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Misrasch*," or to study the notes in Dr. Edersheim's "*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*," to see how thoroughly at home the Evangelist is on Jewish soil. For the second proposition appeal may be made primarily to the life-like presentation of the way in which Christianity gradually detaches itself from Judaism, the gradual testing and acceptance or rejection of the Messianic claims, with the impression which they made upon different classes and sections of the people—a picture of singular variety and delicacy; and appeal may be made secondarily to the clearness, precision, firmness of stroke, or generally graphic effect in the delineation of scenes and characters.\* This last point no doubt admits of a twofold explanation. It may be due to direct contact with the facts, or it may be due to a strong dramatic imagination. The second century does not furnish much encouragement to the latter hypothesis; but it may be allowed that genius sometimes overleaps the conditions of time and place, and therefore we will not press the argument unduly. However this may be, no genius, we contend, would have

\* Let me suggest to the reader to go through for himself such passages as i. 19-28; vii. 11-15, 25-27, 40-52; x. 19-24; xi. 54-57. Let him ask himself in particular if such questions as those in i. 25; iv. 9; vi. 30-31; vii. 15, 27, 38-49; viii. 48; ix. 2; x. 21, would have occurred to a Christian writer in the second century.

treated the collision between Judaism and nascent Christianity as the Evangelist has dealt with it; and we securely rest upon that for proof that no middle link intervenes between the facts and their narrator.

I regret to see that the two propositions I have mentioned are still disputed by Dr. Schürer. At the same time I note with pleasure his admission that the old supposed catalogue of errors in matters Palestinian is no longer tenable. Keim set the example in treating this part of the subject with candor,\* and Dr. Schürer has gone yet further in the path of reasonable criticism. Yet even he leaves one solitary instance still standing, though he allows that it is "not decisive" (!)—the old, well-worn argument that the Evangelist, by speaking of Caiaphas as "high priest of that year" (xi. 49, 51), implied a yearly tenure of the high priesthood.† When we consider how impressed the Evangelist is with the momentous issues of the crisis he is describing, how fond he is of emphasis, and of this particular word *ἐκεῖνος* for conveying emphasis, and the further fact that about the time in question high priests were repeatedly set up and deposed by the Romans (for instance, the three immediate predecessors of Caiaphas in as many years), it would surely be no great straining of the critical conscience not to allow this one most doubtful objection to weigh against the ninety-and-nine good and sound examples of direct acquaintance of the Evangelist with the circumstantial setting of his narrative.

More noteworthy altogether than anything I can remember to have seen in German are the arguments on this head of an English clergyman, the Rev. J. A. Cross, vicar of Little Holbeck, Leeds.‡ These are, however, of different degrees of value, and I hope to examine them at some length in another place.

The last stronghold into which Dr. Schürer retires has two bulwarks—(1) the opposition of the Gospel to Judaism, and (2) the Greek philosophical training of the author.

In regard to (1) Dr. Schürer surely draws large inferences from the simple mention of St. John along with St. Peter and St. James in Gal. ii. 9. The truth is, that we know absolutely nothing of the mental process by which St. John followed the general

movement of the Church toward catholicity, except what we learn from the Gospel (on the supposition that it is genuine). Where the teaching of facts had been so decisive—and in the destruction of Jerusalem, written, as it were, by the hand of heaven itself—it surely is not strange that one who was possessed of such profound ideas as to the working of God in history should have accepted unreservedly a conclusion which fitted in so well with the rest of his thinking. And yet we need not go all the lengths with Franke to hold that the Gospel has its roots very really in the Old Testament, and that the development which it discloses is an extremely gentle and gradual development, marked by no violent breaks or convulsions, but a steady, continuous growth from first to last. And we may hold, too (with Wendt\*), that the attitude of the Evangelist to the Old Testament is essentially that of the Apostolic age, and not that of the period which followed; "that it is not like that of the Rabbis or of Philo; not like that of St. Paul, or of the Gnostics, or any other post-Apostolic estimate; but that it has its analogy only in the attitude of Jesus toward the Old Testament, as attested by St. Mark and by the Logia." When we add to this natural inward growth from definite evangelical premisses an outward removal in time and place from the centre of Judaism, with something of an original sense of antagonism between the spirit of Galilee and of Jerusalem, and between the disciples of Jesus and His persecutors and murderers, it seems to me that all the phenomena receive a satisfactory explanation. On the other hand, the negative theory which is advocated by Dr. Schürer gives by no means a satisfactory account of the fundamental rooting of the Gospel in Old Testament ideas.

This fundamental rooting is, I take it, really a far more important fact than any contact which the Gospel shows with Greek—*i.e.*, with Alexandrian—philosophy. When I first wrote on the Fourth Gospel I accepted what was then the predominant view, that the prologue to the Gospel at least did point to such contact and connection. If I am now inclined to think differently, I hope that I can honestly say that it is not from apologetic motives, but in deference to what I conceive to be a better and truer view of the facts. With the example of St. Paul before us, and the extraordinarily rapid growth which he underwent in a very short space of time, we could not

\* "Jesu von Nazara," i. 133.

† The two Holtzmanns have improved upon this by contending that the notion is borrowed from the Asiatic *ἀρχιερεῖς* (H. Holtzm., "Einf.", p. 469, second edition; O. Holtzm., "Joh.-Ev.," p. 115).

‡ Westminster Review, August 1890, pp. 172-182; Critical Review, Feb. 1891, pp. 152-158; Classical Review, 1890, p. 453 f., 1891, p. 142 f. (cf. p. 245 ff.).

\* "Lehre Jesu," ii. 355.



think it strange if a nature no less receptive showed traces of Hellenistic influence after from twenty to thirty years of residence in a Greek city. But, as at present advised, I am disposed to reduce those traces to a minimum. On this point I should have to join issue directly with Dr. Schürer. I confess that by none of his previous writings was I prepared for the language which he uses in his article, which seems to me to be strangely wrong and beside the mark. "The Logos doctrine is not the only point of contact between the Fourth Gospel and the Græco-Jewish philosophy. The whole world of the Evangelist's thought is much more Hellenistic than (Old Testament) Jewish. The prominent intellectual characteristic which distinguishes him comes from the Greek sphere of education. The essence of salvation consists in the knowledge of the truth; through it freedom is attained. Redemption is therefore effected through enlightenment. So Jesus is the Redeemer, because He brought His revelation" (p. 44). I will confront Dr. Schürer here with another, to whose words he will attach more weight than he will to mine—his former colleague as professor, and his present colleague as editor—Dr. Harnack. I quote from the second edition of the "*Dogmengeschichte*," which is less favorable to my purpose than the first:—

"It is not Greek *theologoumena* which have been at work in the Johannine theology. Even the Logos has little in common with Philo's but the name, and its mention at the beginning of the Book is an enigma, and not the solution of one—but out of the ancient faith of the Prophets and Psalmists the testimony of the Apostles to Christ wrought a new faith in one who lived among Greeks with disciples of Jesus. For this very reason the author must undoubtedly, and in spite of his sharp opposition to Judaism, be held to be a born Jew."\*

There are points in this with which I cannot agree, but it is at least far nearer the truth than what has just been quoted from Dr. Schürer. The interpretation of the prologue to the Gospel by the latter seems to me to rest on a radically wrong exegesis. If the author had meant what Dr. Schürer makes him mean, he would certainly be treading in the footsteps of Philo; but an intellectualism has been imported into his language which is wholly foreign to it. The "enlightenment" of which the prologue speaks is of the character and will, and only in a very subordinate sense of the intellect; and the revelation of God is also the revelation of His will and character, and has nothing to do with metaphysical speculation.

The same error runs through the note in which Dr. Schürer speaks of the doctrine of the Logos (p. 407):

"The Greek expression 'Logos' (John i. 1) is translated in Western versions of the Bible by 'Word.' It might just as well be translated 'Reason' (Vernunft), for the Greek expression signifies both, and the notion which lies at the basis of the conception of Logos allows of both modes of translation. The starting-point of the Logos is not simply the thought that God works by His word, His speaking (Gen. i.), but that He works through His reason, His wisdom (Prov. viii. ix.)."

Dr. Westcott lays down at the beginning of his comment upon the same passage that "the term *λόγος* never has the sense of *reason* in the New Testament;" and the only way in which Dr. Schürer could make good his assertion to the contrary would be by cutting off the prologue from all connection with the Gospel.

I am speaking elsewhere of what seem to me further erroneous assumptions of Dr. Schürer's—in particular of his denial\* (which is not repeated in the article before me) of a connection between the Johannine Logos and the *Memra* of the Targums; but enough will have been said for him to understand where a clear line of separation still lies between us. I believe that I should have with me the great body of defenders of the Gospel in England. We have each learned from the other. At least I confess that I have modified several of the views with which I started quite as much from external teaching as from any growth of knowledge or reflection. The only point on which I suspect that we should be somewhat divided would be as to the extent to which there has been a recasting of form in the Johannine discourses.† I suppose that I should go as far as any one to meet Dr. Schürer in this respect. But I do not see any reason to think that this recasting has been carried beyond the point which would be, I do not say permissible, but natural and probable, in an Apostle.

We, here in England, are perhaps somewhat averse to abstract thinking, but we are attracted all the more by what seem to us touches of nature and the play of actual human life. And as well as we can realize the historical situation in the Gospel, there is so much in it which corresponds, and corresponds so forcibly, with what must have been the reality of Christ's surroundings, that we find it impossible to detach the author from implication in them.

\* "Theol. Literaturzeitung," 1886, col. 5.

† Allowance should also be made for some difference of opinion on the extent of Philonian influence.

\* "Dogmengeschichte," I. 85 (2nd ed.).

I am aware that there is a tendency in Germany, dating, I imagine, from Weizsäcker's "Apostolisches Zeitalter," to find a solution for the problem of the Gospel by referring it to a disciple of the aged Apostle, who made use of the tradition derived from him after he was gone. This is the view which is implied in the passage quoted above from the second edition of Harnack's "Dogmengeschichte" (in the first edition the Gospel was treated as the work of St. John himself), and the same view is hinted at in the German original of Dr. Schürer's paper. It has no doubt at first sight the attractiveness of a compromise. It is, I think, less untenable than the view which denies all association of the Apostle with the Gospel; but I cannot think that any more than that it will hold its own in the end. The characteristic features of the Gospel *are not such as any tradition would have preserved which was not committed to writing*. But the moment we allow that any part of the Gospel was actually written by the Apostle we cannot stop short of assigning the main body of it to him. I must reserve to another occasion some fuller remarks on this point. But in the meantime I would invite any one who was interested in the subject simply to study the passages to which reference was made above (p. 539 *n.*), and they are only a sample of a number of others, and to let them have their rightful weight with him. It is not enough to do as Dr. Schürer does, merely to abandon certain negative arguments and waive certain objections which have been taken to the positive arguments. Those arguments must be allowed to tell in all their force and volume; and if that is done I cannot think that they will be held to be satisfied by a conclusion such as Dr. Schürer's.

## PAINTER AND PREACHER.

BY JAMES STALKER, D.D.

From *Good Words* (London), October, 1891.

THERE is a real philosophical ground behind the comparison of the painter and the preacher. It is the connection between religion and art. This connection is a very prominent historical fact. Religion and art have been wedded on a grand scale, especially in the Roman communion; and art has achieved its greatest triumphs in the service of religion.

But this connection may have been acci-

dental; and Protestants cannot allow that it has been wholly legitimate. Are the things themselves, then, connected in their own nature? They are very closely connected. Religion has to deal with God, and art has to deal with beauty; but may not God and beauty be at bottom different names for the same object, which we call God when it addresses us on the ethical, and beauty when it addresses us on the æsthetic side of our nature?

At least the resemblances between God and beauty are numerous and important.

Beauty inheres in everything—in land and sea, in earth and sky, in plants and animals; in man's soul and in his actions; in the history of the world. Wherever we turn in this system of things wherein we dwell, it looks out on us from every object on which the inner or the outer eye can rest. It is a subtle something, a universally diffused light, immeasurable, elusive, but swelling and breaking softly on every shore of the universe. In it we live, and move, and have our being.

And in man there is something to which beauty appeals: he is a beauty-appreciating being. He was made for it, and rises nearer to his own ideal the more it enters into him. It is, however, a mere philosophical figment to say that it is he who creates it. Where would it be, the idealist asks, if there was no eye to see it? Does it not first come into existence when the brute-mass of the universe assumes form and order in a thinking mind? But this is only an intellectual juggle. Beauty exists out there, whether we perceive it or not—an all-pervading essence, enswathing the whole round of nature.

How like this is to a description of God! He also is everywhere—in nature, in human nature, and in history. There is not a leaf or a blade of grass in which God is not pulsing. Behind the purple streaks of sunrise and the rolling masses of sunset He is hidden, as a figure is within its flowing robes. He is in every just thought of the thinking mind. He is in the rise and fall of empires and the revolutions of peoples. It is the greatest of all heresies to banish Him to the outside of the universe, and make Him a mechanician keeping it going from the outside. "He is not far from every one of us, for in Him we live, and move, and have our being."

On the other hand, there is in man that to which this Presence, which fills every object in the universe around him, appeals: man is a God-perceiving being. He is destined to know God, and his own development is measured by the degree in which he

attain  
deed,  
when  
inter  
orga  
the s  
whic  
whic  
natu  
wort  
migh  
tion  
figm  
natu  
beau  
appe  
the  
men  
fact  
roun  
fact  
less  
relig

M  
God  
lives  
does  
then  
aver  
and  
and

I  
and  
pre  
the  
gre  
God  
diff  
diff  
cei  
the  
ing  
tim

one  
wh  
tru

Fir  
Pe

Ev  
su  
bu  
an  
po  
wh  
ed  
tie  
tin

attains to this knowledge. There is, indeed, a certain kind of philosophy which, when it speaks of man as a religious being, intends only to assert that he has certain organic instincts which project out upon the screen of the universe a vast figure, to which the name of God is given, but to which there is nothing corresponding in the nature of things. This, however, is an unworthy account of the facts of life. As well might it be said that the universal perception of beauty is a mere projection of the figments of the mind upon the screen of nature, in which there exists in reality no beauty at all. In man everywhere religion appears, and its outline is the more distinct the more he rises in the scale of development. The only fair interpretation of this fact is that the universe by which he is surrounded is full of a somewhat—innumerable facts suggests that it is a Someone—ceaselessly making impressions on him, of which religion is the result.

Man is thus a beauty-perceiving and a God-perceiving being. But, although he lives surrounded by beauty and by God, it does not follow that he perceives either of them immediately or fully. In fact, the average man is extremely blind to both; and the power of perceiving either is a slow and gradual acquisition.

Here comes in the function of the artist and the preacher. The artist is the interpreter of beauty to his fellow-creatures, and the preacher is the interpreter of God. The great majority of men require to have both God and beauty pointed out to them in the different regions of the universe and the different aspects of life, before they perceive them; although, after they have seen them once, they have the power of repeating the perception, and even of transmitting it as a hereditary attainment.

In reference to beauty, Robert Browning, one of the profoundest speculators on art who have ever appeared, has expressed this truth in the well-known lines,

"We're made so that we love  
First when we see them painted things we've passed  
Perhaps a hundred times, nor cared to see."

Every one will recognize the justice of this subtle remark in regard to single objects; but it is equally true of classes of objects, and of whole sides of the universe. The power of perceiving the beauty of the world, which is now the universal possession of the educated, has been a very gradual acquisition, some of the steps of which can be distinctly traced. For instance, the apprecia-

tion of the beautiful in landscape is held by first-class authorities to be a comparatively recent acquisition, not dating back much more than a hundred years. I have seen it alleged against Calvin that, although he passed his days in one of the loveliest spots on earth, there is not a line in all his works to show that he had ever looked with any emotion on the Lake of Geneva at his feet, or the glow of sunset on the distant Alps. But this is an ignorant charge; because at that time this was a general defect even of the cultivated, the power of appreciating landscape not being yet developed. The rise of the appreciation of beauty can be traced in the same way in other sections of nature. Thousands of ploughmen have driven their share through the habitation of the "wee, cowerin', timorous" mouse, and crushed the daisy "'mang the weat;" but it is only since the eye of Robert Burns discerned the beauty and pathos of these incidents that they have become beautiful and pathetic to every mind.

Here, then, we see the function of the artists: they are the interpreters of the beauty of the world. They live for it; they are on the watch for it; they discover it in this and that; to a few of the greatest of them it is given to descry it in some large department of nature where it has not been perceived before; and, having learned to see it themselves, they teach mankind to see it.

Precisely similar is the function of the preacher; but it is God, instead of beauty, that he has to see, and help others to see. The savage has sometimes been represented as standing awe-struck in the midst of the universe, out of which he felt God to be looking on him with a million eyes. But the very opposite is the truth. To the savage the world is bare and commonplace, and the power of seeing God in it is a laborious acquisition. Convictions about the existence and nature of God, which are now so wrought into the very texture of the human mind as to appear to be part of its original endowment, have been a slow acquisition from the region of nescience. One here and there perceived God in this thing and that; to some of the greatest minds it was given to see Him on new sides of the universe; to the prophets of one favored nation it pleased Him to give a special revelation of Himself; those who had seen Him for themselves taught others to see Him; and gradually the new power became the possession of humanity at large.

From these principles it would be easy to

derive rules for the behavior of the painter and the preacher in the practice of their callings.

The most fundamental one is this : that the painter must really see beauty, must live in it and enthusiastically love it ; and the preacher must really see God, his one enthusiasm being to see Him with greater clearness and in new regions, and to make others see Him.

The call to follow the artistic life consists in the possession of the gift of seeing beauty. Unless a man sees it more fully than the multitude, to seek artistic fame can be for him only a diseased ambition ; and the station and degree which any one takes among artists must be determined by the extent of his faculty for beauty. It is a question how far this faculty is a power which can be acquired. The general belief appears to be that it is a natural gift, for presence of which no reason can be assigned, except that it has pleased nature to bestow it. We, therefore, call it artistic genius.

Is there a corresponding genius for perceiving God, which is conferred only on exceptional individuals, and of which no account can be given, except that it has pleased the Author of human nature to bestow it ? In the most orthodox systems of theology, the account given of the power of seeing God approximates closely to this, the definition of grace coinciding in many particulars with the definition of genius. And to the language of orthodoxy at this point that of some of the most unorthodox thinkers has had a singular resemblance. Goethe, for example, believed the faculty of religion to be a gift bestowed only on exceptional individuals, and he did not think that it had been bestowed on himself. There is, indeed, this great difference, that, while the gift of genius is in all cases congenital, the gift of grace may supervene at any stage of life ; and probably the safest and truest view is that no human being is inaccessible to it ; but the question whether or not he shall be the possessor of it depends on his own behavior toward Divine influences which are common to all.

It may still, however, be a legitimate inquiry, whether for the true teacher of religion something that deserves to be called a genius for religion be not necessary. While all men have probably in some degree the power of perceiving the beauty of the world, we justify a man for adopting the profession of an artist only if he possesses this faculty in a degree which amounts to genius. Does not the preacher require a similar justification ? Ought he not to be

a man who, if religion did not exist, could create it from the vividness of his own impressions of God ?

At all events the actual vision of beauty and of God alone makes the artist and the preacher. Conventionalism is the bane of art. It comes into existence as soon as artists, instead of maintaining a living converse with the spirit of beauty in the world, rely on the perceptions of their predecessors, painting trees, animals and men, not from their own impressions of these objects, but according to traditional notions of how they should be represented. There have been periods in the history of painting, when artists have nearly ceased to live in contact with nature ; but, although during such periods there has sometimes been developed an extraordinary mastery of the technique of art, yet these have always been periods of decadence ; because nothing will do as a substitute for the direct and living perception of the world.

All this applies in the fullest degree to the occupation of the preacher. He is nothing unless he speaks that which he knows and testifies to that which he has seen. There have been periods in the history of preaching, when preachers have relied on the perceptions of their predecessors, and merely reproduced in their sermons the phrases in which Christian experience had come to be described. But these have always been epochs of decay. Even the phraseology of Scripture may be thus misused. Whatever else may be implied in inspiration, it means at least that the human authors of Scripture had a genius for religion. In them the natural power of perceiving God was potentiated by a supernatural influence, which ordinary men cannot reach. They saw God on every hand, and their perceptions of Him were infallibly veracious. Their writings, therefore, remain for all time the norm for the interpretation of God, and for this purpose they are invaluable. But this does not mean, that we are to rely in such a way on their intuitions as not to take the trouble to see God for ourselves. On the contrary, the Bible exists for the very purpose of leading us forth to a God and a spiritual life, accessible now, whereof we may obtain fresh and present intelligence by our own experience. And it is this personal acquaintance with the Unseen which is the charm and the power of preaching.

If from all the objects in which it inheres—heaven and earth and sea, the soul and the history of man—the wandering and impalpable essence of beauty were to gather

and cond  
in some  
powers  
of color  
ment—  
enchant  
out of t  
test of  
welcom  
ened in  
of beaut  
on the  
sence, w  
the life  
heaven  
man, h  
walked  
the life  
lent act  
and in  
manife  
in it no  
test of  
the hor  
renders

THE

From

THE  
of the

THE  
CHU  
TH  
CIE

Cer  
of cor  
Englis  
mitted  
was e  
discus

In  
but d  
stanc  
A rev  
with  
9th J  
time?

Th  
terbu  
dent  
Upp  
cont  
reply  
to ta  
for r  
ening  
of E



and condense itself, and appear among men in some form of the flesh, in which all the powers of beauty—beauty of form, beauty of color, beauty of sound, beauty of sentiment—were subtly combined—a form more enchanting than even that which was born out of the foam of the Cyprian wave—the test of the artistic spirit would lie in the welcome and homage which would be awakened in artistic natures by this embodiment of beauty. No such vision will ever break on the world of art. But the Divine essence, which encompasses the worlds and is the life of all creatures, which pervades heaven and earth and the conscience of man, has gathered and embodied itself and walked forth among men in the flesh. In the life of Jesus of Nazareth—in His benevolent acts, in His words of grace and truth, and in His atoning death—God has been manifested in a light so clear that there is in it no darkness at all; and the supreme test of the spirit of the preacher consists in the homage of admiration and love which it renders to the Word made Flesh.

#### THE C.M.S. AND BISHOP BLYTH.

From *The Rock* (Ch. Eng.), London, September 4, 1891.

THE following is the heading and full text of the Archbishop's Award:—

#### THE BISHOP OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN JERUSALEM AND THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

Certain questions having become matters of controversy between the Bishop of the English Church in Jerusalem and the Committee of the Church Missionary Society, it was evidently desirable that the points in discussion should be suitably settled.

In 1890 the Bishop published in England, but did not deliver or issue in the first instance to his clergy, "A Primary Charge." A review of this pamphlet was published with other documents by the Society on the 9th Jan. 1891, entitled "C.M.S. in Palestine."

The Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury on 6th Feb. requested "the President and their Lordships the Bishops of the Upper House to consider the statements contained in the Bishop's Charge, and the reply of the Church Missionary Society, and to take such steps as they might deem best for removing existing difficulties, strengthening the catholic relations of the Church of England with the Orthodox Churches of

the East, and rendering renewed and vigorous support to the Mission among the Mohammedans in Palestine."

The Upper House on the 7th Feb. resolved "that the matter be referred to the President to be dealt with at his Grace's discretion."

The Archbishop of Canterbury on the 18th Feb. in a letter to the President of the C.M.S. offered to inquire, in conjunction with the Archbishop of York and other of the Bishops, into the difficulties which had arisen, in the hope of arriving at a satisfactory settlement, and to this end requested the assistance of the Committee. The Archbishop also invited the assistance of Bishop Blyth.

The General Committee of C.M.S. on March 10th, 1891, gladly undertook to render to the Archbishop every assistance in order that fresh information upon the topics under discussion might be afforded him. The reference of such a matter to the Archbishops and Bishops is in fact in accordance with the Laws and Regulations of the Society.

The Bishop expressed his satisfaction with the proposal and returned to England.

We therefore, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester, and of Carlisle in the vacancy of the See of York, proceeded on the 24th and 25th of July to investigate the several existing difficulties. The following is our advice.

1. MISSIONARY CONFERENCE.—In the first two years of his episcopate the Bishop presided at one of two half-yearly meetings of the Missionary Conference as his predecessors had done. The Parent Committee was then consulted as to whether the Bishop was *ex officio* Chairman of that Conference; and replied that, according to rule, his Lordship was not a member of that body. The Bishop claims the right of attending and presiding as belonging to his office.

It appeared in our inquiry that the body called a "Missionary Conference" in the Regulations of the C.M.S., and altogether constituted by those Regulations, exists in each region where the Society has Missionaries, and consists of the Ordained and Lay Missionaries employed by the Society, European or Native, except Assistant Native clergymen; that the latter class, and other Pastors and Catechists of the Church, can be admitted with the sanction of the Parent Committee, and other persons only by Resolution of the same Committee; that this Conference by rule is summoned to meet by the Secretary, and appoints its own

Chairman at each meeting. The objects of the Conference are also strictly defined. They include review of progress, encouragement of local action and organization within the Mission, and brotherly exhortation. Further, where there is no "Corresponding Committee" (as there is not in Palestine), they have duties which are thus described in detail in the *Laws and Regulations of C.M.S. part V. sect. II. "Additional Regulations" 1-7* :—

(1) To exercise a general superintendence over Educational Establishments designed for the benefit of the whole Mission ; such as, Colleges for Training Native Teachers, Model Schools, &c. ; and to appoint Visiting Committees to inspect and report upon the same unless other provision be made by the Parent Committee.

(2) To confer upon translations of the Holy Scriptures and Book of Common Prayer, and upon the preparation of other vernacular works ; also to consult upon linguistic questions arising out of the same.

(3) To consult upon and propose to the Parent Committee the location or changes of location of Missionaries whenever circumstances require it ; and generally to propose to the Parent Committee such changes as may seem to them desirable for the interests of the Mission.

(4) To examine and receive such Catechists, European or Native, as it may be proposed to receive into *local connection* with the Mission, who must be recommended by one at least of the Society's Missionaries in the district, who has had sufficient opportunities of testing the character and Missionary qualifications of the candidate, and is willing to certify that he will be a suitable Agent of the Society, upon the principle "that none but spiritual agents can carry on spiritual work."

(5) To examine the cases of Schoolmasters whom it is proposed to receive into *local connection*.

(6) To make arrangements respecting the location, employment, and dismissal of Agents in *local connection*.

(7) To consult upon the erection, if the necessities of the Mission may require it, of new Missionary Buildings, of Churches, or of School houses, and to refer plans and estimates for the same to the consideration of the Finance Committee or any other Committee which may be appointed for this purpose by the Parent Committee.

It should be added that the "Missionary Conference" is parallel to, and on the same footing with, the "Finance Committee," being entirely under the control and direction of the "Parent Committee."

We recognize the fact that a special discussion of such specified subjects as are here described is generally necessary among those subordinately entrusted with their administration.

But it appears to us that it is scarcely consistent with the dignity of the Bishop that he should be a member of a Committee whose duties, although most useful, are local, personal, or strictly limited by Regulations of the Society ; that he should be summoned by one of his clergy to attend ; and that it should be constitutionally possible that if he attended another chairman might be elected.

In the long vacancy of the See this Conference has undoubtedly discussed matters which are not properly within its scope, because some settlement on the spot was peremptorily required. Indeed, the practice of the Bishop's attendance, which had insensibly grown up in contravention of regulation (for the Bishop had never been nominated a member), had led to its being consulted by him on affairs quite beyond its range. If, consequently, the Conference has itself extended its purview to disciplinary questions, which are beyond its powers, this is not to us a matter of great surprise. But it is desirable that the irregularity should be ended, and that the Conference should henceforth confine itself to its defined subjects ; and the Parent Committee in England considers that the subjects proposed for its discussion should in all cases be submitted beforehand to the Bishop, and that any suggestions or resolutions arrived at should be immediately reported to him, for his consideration and approval. If any of its *acta* or *agenda* should appear to be *ultra vires*, the Parent Committee would immediately require that they should be referred back to the Bishop.

It would follow that when the Conference desired the counsel of the Bishop on any matters, the suitable course would be that its members should wait on him by deputation or otherwise, and not that he should be summoned or invited to attend their meeting.

We are not, therefore, of opinion that the position of the Bishop would be in any way strengthened, his dignity consulted, or his authority duly observed, if he had a place within the Conference.

But we are strongly of opinion, and in this opinion we have the hearty concurrence of the C.M.S. Parent Committee, that the proper body to be convened at stated times for the consideration of all branches of the work, experience, and duty of the clergy in Palestine, and of subjects which arise out

of them, clergy, in ports of t be the Bishop of work

It was whether still larg of Laym "Dioces in any c should b authorit entertain would g

Neith from th power. would b Bishop, all bran

2. R are info ant Nat present rates to tion of There stipend paid by mitted) Bishop precise land. the pa and it position enties of the of the rules. port in the S called not ta will su in all pensio sider pensio author sionar

The try m carryi an ar Licen cases, Agen that such

of them, is a Synod of the whole body of clergy, including the missionaries. The Reports of the "Missionary Conference" would be then brought before the Synod by the Bishop at his discretion, like other reports of work within his jurisdiction.

It would be for the Bishop to consider whether it might be desirable to convene a still larger body, containing a representation of Laymen (answering in a measure to a "Diocesan Conference" in England); but in any case we think that a Synod of Clergy should be assembled annually by the Bishop's authority, and the Committee of the C.M.S. entertain no doubt that every Missionary would gladly attend it.

Neither of such bodies could possess, from the nature of the case, legislative power. But their deliberative meetings would be of the greatest assistance to the Bishop, and a powerful encouragement in all branches of the work.

2. RELATIONS BETWEEN CLERGY.—We are informed that the relation of the Assistant Native Clergy to the Missionaries is at present analogous to that of Licensed Curates to Incumbents at home, and no suggestion of change has been brought before us. There is this difference, viz., that the stipends of the Assistant Native Clergy are paid by the Society, and therefore (as is admitted) their immediate relation to the Bishop and their appeal to him cannot be precisely upon the same footing as in England. Difficulties, however, which have in the past arisen have now been adjusted; and it is believed that the necessities of the position are not such as to create new difficulties. Mutual consideration of the force of the Bishop's License and of the position of the Society should obviate any need of rules. The Superintendents ought to report immediately both to the Bishop and to the Society any case in which they feel called upon to take action. They should not take action in cases where their report will suffice, and any such action should be in all cases temporary, not exceeding suspension from discharge of duty. We consider that any financial change, e.g., suspension of stipend, should be under other authority, and not be exercised by the Missionaries.

The peculiar circumstances of the country may offer important opportunities for carrying on distinct work among Jews within an area already assigned in the Bishop's License to a Missionary of C.M.S. In such cases, wherever the Bishop licenses a special Agent or Missionary for this work, we think that the License should expressly limit any such Agent's work to this definite duty;

and he should be instructed to take no work among resident English or others outside his special function except upon express agreement of the Bishop with the Society's representatives.

All agree that there is need of more workers in the field. The Society cannot increase its staff with due regard to the claims of other places, and we consider it, therefore, very necessary that in many places not occupied by the Society the Bishop himself should plant, as he proposes, medical missionaries, women workers, and other agents, lay or clerical, and we strongly recommend the development of the Bishop's fund for these important purposes and for the buildings which the Bishop earnestly desires to raise.

3. MOHAMMEDANISM.—With regard to the diffusion of Christianity among Mohammedans, the Bishop and the Society appear to be at one in principle. This was and is the primary object of the whole work. It is work difficult and discouraging in the highest degree—partly on account of recognizable merits in the system which has to be displaced, and of the high character of many who sincerely live in its obedience. It is admitted on both sides that final success must be achieved mainly by the employment of well-instructed Natives, able and zealous to represent Christianity with knowledge and intelligence, in outlines free from idolatrous or superstitious practices despised by the Moslem. It is manifest that at present the work has to be carried on indirectly through the progress of the Native Christians themselves. Some diversities in practice are thus not only unavoidable, but are even desirable. The stage of experiment has not yet been traversed. We think that the Society will do well to give careful consideration to some suggestions of the Bishop in detail.

4. PROSELYTISM.—The Bishop has stated "that the C.M.S. engages in systematic aggression on the Churches of the East, in concert with similar efforts of the American Presbyterians . . . and in this view their various agents are appointed."

The C.M.S. has, in reply, clearly stated that if any agents have proceeded in this manner they were not appointed with this view; and that aggression on other Churches is not part of its system; its ultimate aim is the evangelization of Mohammedans; it believes that any impression to be made on Mohammedans at large must be mainly made by Oriental Christians, who nevertheless have for centuries done nothing for their enlightenment; that to that end reforms are essential, and it has circulated the

Holy Scriptures among them as the true basis and hope of such reform. The statement made by the C.M.S. is that "They preach the Gospel according to the doctrines of the Church of England to all who are willing to hear, and admit to the services held by them all who are willing to attend—whether Mohammedans, Jews, or Christians, and give instruction to all inquirers, of whatever religion." "There is no direct, special, controversial teaching in our schools against the errors of the Eastern Churches; our teaching is positive and constructive, not destructive."

The Bishop has now declared himself thankful that the Society thus distinctly repudiates the employment of agents for aggressive purposes, and point by point his Lordship assents to the above principles. The instruction of individuals whose consciences are affected, and their association with the English Church, he regards as inevitable. He informs us "that he has never differed from the C.M.S. as regards the treatment of individuals—and that he does not see how to limit their reception." He thinks it impossible to exclude hearers from our Churches. The highest dignitaries not infrequently attend our services.

We find no indication that the Society desires to act in concert with the American Presbyterians, or through agents trained by that body, in aggression upon other Churches. Circumstances which may have given color to the idea are either of the far past, or are explicable and explained. There is no doubt that the agents are constantly placed in positions of great difficulty owing to the want of education, the peasant rank, and in some cases the low moral standard of the monks and clergy, and that everything which tends to elevate or educate these, or to produce the desire for internal improvement, is not only beneficial to the Churches themselves, and welcome to their leading men, but is also the surest road to the conversion of Moslems.

The Society judges that in the course of the progress which all desire, the formation of small congregations is practically unavoidable, but that such progress would in time to come itself render them unnecessary. The Bishop does not take this in view; he thinks that much may be done by frank communication with ecclesiastical authorities in cases as they occur. But he also considers that the congregations which have long existed could not be disbanded, and would simply become Presbyterian if neglected. He pleads strongly for more and better appointed churches for them and for

the English residents in each place. We have not found it necessary to pursue the question of what other provision would be at first possible for converts from Mohammedanism, or for individuals impelled on enquiry to unite themselves to us, or for the families of either. The treatment of the matter will be much in the Bishop's hands, and for the rest we are sure the Society will give the utmost consideration to the Bishop's suggestions.

We think that personal explanation has smoothed the principal difficulties of the situation. In ground so uncertain and exceptional it is not possible to formulate rules, still less to adhere to them. But we are persuaded that as difficult cases arise, mutual intelligence and good-will promise all needful solutions.

5. CONFIRMATION AND CHRISM.—The question is whether children, brought up by English churchmen or by others, who have received in infancy the Chrism of the Greek Church, but have not had the laying-on of hands by the Bishop, should be admitted without it to Holy Communion.

While we forbear to assert that those who are held in the Greek Church to have fully received Confirmation, ought nevertheless in all cases to receive the Laying-on of Hands as a condition of being admitted to Holy Communion in our Church, yet we think that the Laying-on of Hands ought not to be refused to any candidates with regard to whom the Bishop himself is satisfied that, however they may have reached it, they truly entertain an intelligent and conscientious desire for it. Nor do we think it would be difficult to explain to the authorities of the Greek Church that, while the English Church acknowledges the right of all churches to determine, within the limits allowed by Scripture, their own ritual, it lays great stress on what it believes to be the Apostolic method of administering Confirmation as recorded in the Scriptures and preserved in our own Church.

We think it desirable to point out, since we observe that the Lambeth Conference, 1888, is frequently cited as having given a decision on this question, that neither the Encyclical Letter nor the Resolutions passed by that Conference make any mention of the subject.

In conclusion we press alike on the Bishop and on the Society the exceeding duty which lies upon them to preserve both the unity and the dignity of their counsels and action in presentment of the true position of the English Church. Our Church has passed without break through the Reform of which

she believ  
need. He  
she presen  
Scriptural  
her bound  
churches,  
and the L

In Pale  
but it is  
difficulty  
interests  
claimed a  
tegral par  
the long  
and over  
measure  
order, bu  
life is liv  
elsewhere  
presence  
churches  
impressi  
been ke  
which w  
gance on  
of the  
and are  
sire to c  
which  
only th  
very ch  
We act  
tion wh  
up in t  
to reve  
tory an

It is  
strenuo  
ness.

A co  
not exi  
carryin  
ings w  
human  
heard  
devote  
of opi  
any al  
busine  
with t  
passio  
which  
preser  
which  
offer,



she believes Eastern churches to stand in need. Her doctrines, ordinances, and rites, she presents as primitive, apostolical, and Scriptural. She feels intensely that it is her bounden duty, and the duty of other churches, to convert the Jew, the Moslem, and the Heathen to Christ.

In Palestine the situation is one of duty, but it is also one of peculiar and solitary difficulty. In that country, where religious interests cluster thickest, our Church has claimed a right to be represented as an integral part of Christendom. Not only must the long abeyance there of its chief office and overseership have of necessity in some measure deflected the common current of order, but, under any circumstances, Church life is lived, and action taken amid relations elsewhere unknown. We act there in the presence of several ancient Christian churches in which there is much that is impressive, and much wanting; which have been kept in disability for centuries, and which we believe we can aid without arrogance or interference. We act in presence of the power whose oppressions have been and are so effectual, whose religion we desire to change as bearers of the Gospel, and which yet we must and can finally assail only through the clergy and laity of the very churches which it at present contemns. We act among a steadily increasing population whose past and whose future is bound up in the very soil; to them also we labor to reveal the true meaning of their own history and their own hope.

It is not possible to put in words the strenuousness of the duty of peacefulness.

A community in which varying views did not exist as to the wisest or safest means of carrying out such work in such surroundings would be a body neither Catholic nor human. But we earnestly say that we have heard and seen among those who are alike devotedly engaged in the work no diversities of opinion which to our minds will justify any absence of practical harmony. Our business is with the future rather than with the past, and we believe that the dispassionate explanations and candid listening which either side gave to the other in our presence will, by the help of the suggestions which in our office we have been enabled to offer, have cleared the way of peace.

EDW. CASTUAR.  
F. LONDIN.  
B. F. DUNELM.  
A. W. WINTON.  
H. CARLIOL.

*Lambeth, August 17th, 1891.*

# THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM —EXPRESSIONS OF OPINION BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR, REV. JOSEPH PARKER, D.D., AND REV. HUGH PRICE HUGHES, M.A.

From *The Christian Union* (Undenomin.), New York, October 17, 1891.

## A CHURCH OF ENGLAND VIEW.

BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR.

No one can doubt the loss which has resulted to the kingdom of Christ from the disunion, and still more from the mutual hostilities, of Christians. Unity is a thing which we all profess to desire, and even the duldest imagination may conceive what results might be accomplished both at home and abroad by the concentrated effort of all Christians, working together, heart and soul, for the achievement of common ends. To borrow a recent illustration, separate drops of water have but little force, but unite them into one great volume, and they form a Niagara whose unceasing power might quench the fires of Etna. If the time, the energy, the temper, wasted in futile and often bitter controversies were diverted to worthier ends, the diminution of friction and the increase of enthusiasm might add an almost incalculable momentum to efforts directed against the real foes of mankind. What economy might be effected by merging into one the expensive and elaborate organizations for good of a multitude of religious bodies! What a hindrance to missions would be removed if Christianity faced heathendom with an undivided front, instead of sometimes showing, as now it shows, four or five different groups of missionaries working in jealous, and to the heathen incomprehensible, isolation in some single field! How far greater would be the power to face the deadly evils of the present, and the menacing problems of the future, if, instead of showing in every little town—almost in every hamlet—specimens of what Milton calls "the subdichotomies of petty schisms"—often separated from each other and from the Church of England by unessential and even infinitesimal differences about minor and highly disputable matters of opinion—the ardor of Christian love burned on God's altar with an undivided flame! We profess to deplore our disagreements and oppositions. We pray that the universal Church may be inspired continually with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord. We pray for "grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our

unhappy divisions." Unless all these prayers and professions be hypocritical, they should be followed by real efforts. Now, there have been marked signs, of late, that the desire for some form of reunion among Christian bodies is more than an idle profession. One such sign was the Lambeth circular. Another is the convening of various informal meetings like the Langham Street Conference, and Canon Fremantle's "Christian Conference," and the existence of Lord Nelson's "Home Reunion Society." A third is the publication of various books intended to formulate the terms of some eirenicon. We sympathize with all who work in this direction, but certain conditions are indispensable to their success.

1. Unity is not uniformity. Unity is in the highest sense essential, nor can the Israel of God truly flourish so long as Ephraim envies Judah, and Judah vexes Ephraim. But *Uniformity* is not essential, nor perhaps even desirable. It certainly does not exist in the Church of England. If the Church of England can hold together as one body in spite of differences between its members which separate them more widely from each other than from some bodies outside her pale, it ought not to be impossible to find terms of a concordat which would at once render it possible to reunite various dissenting communities to the National Church.

2. But this cannot be done without mutual concessions. Nothing but bitterness can arise from the uncompromising accentuation of points of disagreement. Take, for instance, the question of the Historic Episcopate. It is certain that many are convinced that it is a matter of primary importance, essential to the *bene esse*, if not to the *esse*, of any Church. But many Christians, equally learned, equally devout, are no less unalterably convinced that it is not. Now, contradictories cannot be reconciled, and if neither side is likely to convert the other, would it not be better to find some *modus vivendi* in which both can harmoniously work together? In the Church on earth there always must be, as there always have been, many folds—many folds which differ from each other in construction—while yet there always has been, and always will be, one flock.

3. And this is certain—that there can be no more fatal cause of exasperation and permanent disunion than will arise from any attempt on the part of the Church of England, or any of its members, to *unchurch* the Dissenters; to treat them as though they were mere outsiders in the common

Church of Christ; to hand them over with gracious and patronizing arrogance to uncovenanted mercies. The great majority of the Nonconformist bodies hold with us, and no less firmly than we do, the great eternal Christian verities. They belong, no less than we do, to the great body of those to whom St. Paul sent his blessing—namely, to all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth. No less than we, they are "very members incorporate in the mystical body of Christ which is the blessed company of all faithful people." They have been enriched by the divine blessing, and have shown in the ripest specimens of saintliness those fruits of the Spirit by which they may be known as belonging to the Church of God. Will any member of the Church of England, or even of the Church of Rome out of the darkest corner of Mexico or Spain, dare to say that the door of heaven shall not open to these as widely and as spontaneously as to any one of us? If, then, they shall be no less than ourselves honored members of the Church of the redeemed in heaven, it seems to be a small and unwarrantable bigotry to treat them, or to speak of them, as though they do not belong to the Church of Christ on earth. Instead of adopting or hinting at such untenable and exasperating insinuations, can we not provoke one another to love and good works? Can we not, cheerfully and always, put in the forefront the eternal truths of the Gospel respecting which we are unanimous, and relegate to the background the question of organization and minor differences about which as yet we are unable to agree?

#### A CONGREGATIONALIST'S VIEW.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH PARKER, D.D.

I entirely agree with the desire for Union which is growing on every hand. Is unity compatible with diversity? I answer emphatically in the affirmative. Diversity is a note of life: unity is a note of love. My personal conception of orthodoxy enables me to mingle freely and educationally with men from whom I differ widely in intellectual speculation. I am more and more convinced that men will never be united in opinion. Nor is it desirable that they should be. Opinion is necessarily variable and progressive. My opinion is but a line in a diary. To-morrow it may be changed. The business of men is to take more care for moral constancy than for verbal consistency. It is along this line that I find insuperable

objections to written test-creeds. To write such creeds seems to me to distrust the Holy Ghost, and to create an artificial or professional conscience. I now speak of such creeds as are regarded as final and practically infallible—not as indicating general and substantial beliefs as a basis of trustful co-operation. If I may speak frankly—and I may do so because I speak on my own responsibility alone—I would take all written creeds of all churches and deposit them in the centre of the hottest furnace. They create false orthodoxies. They breed superstitions. They divide the loyalty which is due to the Scriptures alone. They make men word-peckers and nibblers, adverb-and-preposition Christians, rather than humble-hearted and beneficent worshippers.

Congregationalists have no written creed, but they have what, in my judgment, is infinitely worse. They have a syllabus which every man is allowed to treat as a theological football. It consists of words which every man may change, and of propositions which every man may modify or repudiate. It is full of I. O. U.'s, which no man ever signs, and it indicates barometrical pressure, by which no man regulates his clothing or his ventilation. It is a most ghostly and a most ghastly thing; a white spectre; a shapeless outline; an india-rubber idol (change the figure as your fancy wills)—something wholly destitute of dignity, having neither the form nor the power of authority. In addition to this pulpy syllabus, Congregationalists have in some cases theological trust-deeds, on the basis of which they hold their denominational property. These trust-deeds are never read. They are skeletons in the cupboard. Some churches do not even know where their trust-deeds are! All this is worse than farcical. Why not publicly proclaim the solemn and ennobling fact that our unity is in our love of truth rather than in its literal possession? To love truth is infinitely more than to know it. I hold that in proportion as a man is really evangelical, in the sense that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the world, is he large-minded, catholic, and hopeful. An evangelical little-man is a fraud and a pest.

Are we, then, to do away with opinions, with beliefs, with watchwords? It is impossible. We cannot live or associate without beliefs. But that is very different from organizing and reticulating them into elaborate or academic statements, and saying—"Believe these, or be heterodox." We can agree to love Christ without agreeing to de-

fine him. I do not admit that we are called to definition of a critical or pedantic kind. Christianity is not a trick in words. Christianity may be injured by its clever adapters. Faith is essential: detailed verbal statement may easily become mischievous. Words themselves have a fashion which passeth away. The word which is well understood to-day may have another and even an offensive meaning in a century. Our union, therefore, cannot be in our changeable words; it must be in our incorruptible love.

It is supposed that Congregationalists and Baptists might unite. I think they might approach. They must always maintain their distinctiveness. I do not understand how any man can be what is generally understood as a Baptist. But some of the greatest men have been Baptists and are Baptists. They cannot understand how anybody can be anything else. Very well. That did not hinder confidence and approach. Declare the difference (which is not merely ritual), and occupy the common ground of endeavoring to do good in the name and the power of Christ. If any man in my congregation wished to be baptized, he might spend the rest of his life in a reservoir or river without my seeking to interfere with his convictions. Indeed, I do not see why I should refuse to baptize him. Will Baptist ministers baptize little children? I would leave Baptism as an open question, on which the sincerest minds in all ages have been unable to agree, saying, Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. On this basis Congregationalists and Baptists might at once approach each other in the most trustful spirit. They meet one another socially, they preach for one another congregationally, why should they not by public and formal declaration (without interfering with their respective ecclesiastical frameworks) affirm their brotherhood and present a completer front to the world?

But this measure of union would by no means satisfy me. I would go much further, and would even go in hitherto forbidden directions. I would make excommunication on doctrinal grounds impossible. So long as there was no suspicion about a man's sincerity and general goodness of life, I would retain him in the Church, if he wished to remain, though great changes may have occurred in his intellectual views. One condition must, of course, be insisted upon. The man must not set himself to counterwork the prevailing and uniting sentiment of the community. If he must do that he is bound to do it from the outside.

A propagandist must find his own board and lodging. I hold that a church is not a debating club, but a school, a nursery, a protecting home. When a man thinks it necessary to go to war with his fellow-members, he is bound to surrender to them the advantages which they have conferred upon him, and to occupy independent ground. Men have no right to compromise one another. I draw a broad distinction between an earnest inquirer and a blatant or bitter controversialist. There is one man with whom I never unite, and I will name him by describing his unholy and monstrous tenet. He is the man who believes in the partiality of the Cross, or in what he blasphemously describes as "distinguishing grace." I always notice that he himself has been picked out for special favors. He makes it clear to his own mind that, whoever is saved or lost (even if his own children be in either number), he has been indispensable to the happiness of God. Any man who holds this doctrine I regard as an infidel of the worst type. How can I unite with such a man when I hold that Jesus Christ tasted death for every man, and, in Paul's language, gave himself a "ransom for all"? I believe in the universality of God's love. To that love and all its blessings I call the most reprobate and the most despairing of men. This is the sweet gospel to whose proclamation my whole life is called; when, therefore, I meet a man who glories in discriminating and specializing grace, I brand him as an enemy to the kingdom which he has never entered.

Christian union can never be realized by artificial means. There have always been many tinkers, willing, on remunerative terms, to do a good deal of ecclesiastical soldering. I have no faith in their motive or in their practice. The only union worth striving for, or praying for, is the union which flows from an ever-deepening and ever-heightening love of Christ. If we do not keep the first commandment, we can never keep the second. When our souls are full of the love of Christ, we cannot help loving the brethren. They belong to us and we belong to them. Not by parchments, resolutions, sub-committees, and compromises can Christian union ever be realized. It must come from the land of the green spring and the ruddy summer. There will be no earth-marks upon it. It will be as the dawn, silent, unaided, irresistible—a very miracle of blessedness. There are some things of a negative kind which we can all be doing. We can discourage cen-

seriousness. We can frown down all spiteful criticism. We can put to silence the gainsaying of foolish men. Then, positively, we can preach with the eloquence of character, and lay hold of many by the beauty and unselfishness of our conduct who can never follow the subtleties and contradictions of our metaphysics.

Disputable questions of all sorts, and not of one sort only, must be left open if genuine union is to be realized and enjoyed—such questions, of course, being disputable as among believers, and not as viewed by hostile criticism. For example, how many theories are there of Inspiration? of the Atonement? of Baptism? of Churchism? of Priesthood? Clearly upon these points we have no more to hope for from verbal controversy; we must, therefore, adopt the working condition of union, which is that the best and wisest men may take differing and even opposing views, and yet hold substantially the same central and controlling faith. Men may hold that the Bible is inspired without asking, How? in what degree? to what extent? Inspiration is greater than any of its definitions can be. It would be enough for me if any Church believed in Inspiration—whatever the academic theory of it might be. It would also be enough as a basis of union, wherever union is mutually desired, that a man should believe in the Christian Church, whether Papal, Anglican, or Congregational. Here again the rule applies. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. I hold that individual conviction is infinitely preferable either to hereditary assent or the spiritual paralysis which is glossed over with the name of indifference. My rule of interpretation enables me to unite with many who are exiled or stigmatized as unorthodox. I find the point of union in a common sincerity. The one man whose influence is fatal to union is the dogmatist—a term often misunderstood and misapplied. In my judgment, a man is a dogmatist when he says that he alone is right, and that what he says is complete, absolute, and final. This position may never be set forth in plain terms, yet the spirit of it may be detected in many a monstrous claim. The man who sets himself up as the censor of his brethren, always knowing who is right and who is wrong, and never even hinting at his personal fallibility, is not a Christian, though he speak louder than the winds and make the most daring professions of piety. The withdrawal of such a man would be a gain to any Christian society.

BY THE

Undou  
istic ecc  
widespre  
unhappy  
those ecc  
real hind  
of this  
spend so  
selves ec  
ing to u  
so unde  
on their  
dom. V  
has been  
our own  
all reall  
late the  
have no  
centripe  
more po  
ago, we  
ness of  
tages v  
Christe  
sentime  
senting  
me, wh  
the pag  
view, a  
union c  
article,  
standp  
tianty  
all pro  
these  
come  
Christi  
should  
and th  
of the  
ment t  
the op  
very te  
excited  
of the  
should  
consum  
that in  
Christ  
of tw  
would  
ternal  
mands  
ably b  
be sh  
than t  
pecial



## A METHODIST'S VIEW.

BY THE REV. HUGH PRICE HUGHES, M.A.

Undoubtedly one of the most characteristic ecclesiastical features of our day is a widespread yearning for reunion. Even the unhappy disposition to accentuate some of those ecclesiastical tenets which are the only real hindrances to reunion is an indication of this movement of thought; those who spend so much time in claiming for themselves ecclesiastical monopolies and in trying to unchurch their fellow-Christians do so under the delusion that such proceedings on their part promote the unity of Christendom. When we remember how far disunion has been carried in the past, this feature of our own day is very astonishing. I think all really catholic Christians may congratulate themselves that the centrifugal forces have now spent their strength, and that the centripetal forces are becoming more and more powerful. At one time, not very long ago, we heard a good deal about the blessedness of disunion and the immense advantages which arose from the divisions of Christendom. The utter absurdity of that sentiment, once very popular in certain Dissenting quarters, was first brought home to me, when I was a mere boy, by reading, in the pages, I think, of the *Westminster Review*, an article upon the subject of the Reunion of Christendom. The writer of that article, regarding the proposal from the standpoint of those who have rejected Christianity, offered the strongest opposition to all proposals of reunion, because, he said, if these Christians reunite, "What's to become of us?" He declared that if the Christians of Europe once stood shoulder to shoulder their power would be irresistible, and there would be no room for the enemies of the Christian faith. I realized in a moment that the disunion of Christendom was the opportunity of atheism, and that the very terror which the prospect of reunion excited in certain infidel quarters was one of the strongest reasons why Christians should do their utmost to promote that consummation. I do not deny or doubt that in the unhappy past the disruption of Christendom was inevitable—was the lesser of two evils. No really Christlike man would hesitate for a moment to sacrifice external unity to truth and the supreme commands of Christ. It would be immeasurably better that the Christian Church should be shattered into ten thousand fragments than that the rights of conscience, and especially the direct right of every human

being to come to Christ as his personal Saviour, should be abandoned. Nevertheless, it seems to me that disunion is only the lesser of two evils. The fact that under certain circumstances it was inevitable does not contradict the indisputable fact that it is accompanied by terrible practical evils. The waste of time and energy occasioned by the fratricidal strife of Christians is incalculable. The loss of hope, *esprit de corps*, enthusiasm, and expectation of victory on the part of the Christians is even more deplorable. Nothing tends to demoralize any army so much as strife in its own ranks. The buoyancy, the confidence, of primitive Christianity has been almost lost in consequence of heartrending and hope-shattering strife. Above all, the *odium theologicum* has brought the Christian Churches into public contempt, and has furnished the enemies of Christianity with their most persuasive and crushing arguments. As the result of our disunion, the great majority of the European races are at this moment outside the Christian Church, and the overwhelming majority of the human race are heathen. These evils are so colossal that we ought to be prepared, for the sake of union, to sacrifice everything except loyalty to Christ. I cannot even understand the state of the Christian man's mind who would hesitate for a single moment to give up everything that was not absolutely essential, rather than postpone for a day the union which would bring us irresistible strength in the presence of the enemies of Christ. I have not finally abandoned the hope that the whole of Christendom may some day be reunited. There is no insuperable difficulty even now in the way of a general reunion of all the Churches which may be called evangelical. The Nonconformists of this country, the great Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and the Continent, the vast Protestant communities of our kinsmen beyond the seas, and the evangelical and liberal section of the Anglican communion, are in substantial agreement at this moment.

I have long felt that the late Frederick Myers, the author of the remarkable "Catholic Thoughts on the Bible and Theology," which all good men should read, was right in his conviction that the only real dividing line among the Christian Churches is the doctrine of the Apostolical succession. That is the watershed of Christendom; and the ultimate direction of thought and action is determined by our relation to that doctrine, whether we are on this side of it or on that. When any one can deliberately state, as the

late Canon Liddon stated in St. Paul's Cathedral, that the episcopate is essential, not only to the *bene esse*, but to the very *esse* of the Christian Church, he has cut himself away from his fellow-Christians by an almost impassable gulf. All who do not hold that amazing doctrine could, without any serious difficulty, establish a *modus vivendi* with one another, provided always that the question of political Church establishments was settled. The only real hindrance to the immediate reunion of the Presbyterians of Scotland is in the establishment of one of the fragments of Presbyterianism; and in this country the liberal and evangelical section of the Church of England are immeasurably nearer to us than to the extreme party whose eloquent mouthpiece I have just quoted. Nothing but the Establishment controversy prevents that fact from being realized.

But must we utterly despair of the ultimate union even of those who at this moment make the episcopal system essential to the existence of the Christian Church, and so doing excommunicate millions of the best Christians in the world? The views expressed by the late Canon Liddon are, of course, held with equal vehemence by the Greek Church and the Roman Catholic Church. In some respects the Roman Catholic Church is further from us even than the Greek Church, for the Greek Church herself rejects the Papacy and the late Ultramontane and Jesuitical developments of so-called Latin Christianity. If, therefore, we can discover a ray of hope, even amid the gloom of Roman intolerance, nothing is impossible. I cannot help thinking that Roman Catholics of the type of Cardinal Manning would ultimately find a way of reconciling their views with a due recognition of those whom Christ has unmistakably recognized, and of modifying their irreconcilable attitude to an extent that seems incredible now. Some time ago Cardinal Manning was good enough to give me his work on "The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost," and I was surprised to read in the very first sentences of that book the following statements:

Two Pontiffs have condemned as heresy the two following assertions: That the heathen, and the Jews, and heretics receive no influence from Jesus Christ, but that their will is without help—that is, without grace—was condemned as a heresy by Alexander VIII. Again, that there is no grace given outside the Church was also condemned as heresy by Clement XI. The work, therefore, of the Holy Ghost, even in the order of nature, so to say—that is, outside of the Church of God and of the revealed knowledge of Jesus Christ among the heathen—that working is universal in the soul of every individual human being; and if they who

receive the assistance of the Holy Ghost are faithful in corresponding with it, God, in His unrevealed mercies, will deal with them in ways secret from us. His mercies, unknown to us, are over all His works, and the infinite merits of the Redeemer of the world are before the mercy-seat of our heavenly Father, for the salvation of those that follow even the little light which in the order of nature they receive.

Surely in this remarkable paragraph we have a loophole through which divine love and common sense may stream in! If two Roman Pontiffs have declared *ex cathedra* that heathen, Jews, and heretics receive the grace of Jesus Christ, and that the work of Jesus Christ is carried on successfully outside the pale of what Cardinal Manning at present calls "the Church," the growth of true enlightenment in the Roman communion may, ages or centuries hence, make a *modus vivendi* possible even between Protestants and Roman Catholics. No one will suppose that I have any sympathy with distinctively Romish doctrines. I belong to the only race in Europe which has neither a Roman Catholic church nor an infidel hall of science. We Welshmen allow no one to come between us and Jesus Christ. He is the supreme Head of all our churches, and he only. We cannot recognize any man as his vicar, because we deny that he is absent from earth. He is here in the midst of us now, and therefore there is no more room among us Welsh Christians for any vicar of Christ than there is in this country, where the British sovereign herself resides, room for a viceroy. Nevertheless, although I am apparently at this moment as far removed from Cardinal Manning as the poles, I know that he is a most devout Christian, and that he accepts the supreme headship of Christ as truly as I do, although in his theory there is a place for a human vicar for whom I cannot find any room. And I rejoice to believe that the humanity and catholic spirit which breathes through the passage I have quoted indicates that the logic of facts is stronger than the logic of theory, and that the best Roman Catholics are compelled in some way or other to explain the existence of millions of undoubted Christians outside their own communion.

One of the most remarkable and gratifying features of the age is the way in which Cardinal Manning, Bishop Vaughan, of Salford, and others of the Roman communion co-operate with their fellow-Christians in the promotion of all sorts of social reform. Here, indeed, reunion, in the sense of co-operation, can begin at once—has, indeed, begun already. It is already an accomplished fact that in the promotion of Temperance, Social Purity, Peace, and other

great en-  
more act-  
ten that  
case sh-  
agree w-  
others t-  
ions sho-  
possible  
promoti-  
objects f-  
compro-  
demonst-  
I have q-  
of name-  
extreme-  
better th-  
truly be-  
and Ser-  
they bel-  
very mu-  
fess to b-  
tradition-  
and shi-  
anarchic-  
appear-  
really th-  
ardently  
unions  
preceded  
"Those  
leisure.  
all Chr-  
operate  
way.  
much g-  
lectual,  
we com-  
another  
ences g-  
under t-  
therefo-  
ultimat-  
absolut-  
once a-  
hold, w-  
Leibnit-  
be seri-  
the oth-  
that po-  
before  
Christe-  
practic-  
If re-  
be brow-  
of the  
as a w-  
surpris-  
can re-  
stealing  
other C-  
their c-

great enterprises all Christians can once more act together; and let it not be forgotten that this has never hitherto been the case since the Reformation. I strongly agree with Dr. Paton, Lord Nelson, and others that Christian men of all communions should co-operate together as much as possible and as frequently as possible in the promotion of those public and humanitarian objects for the sake of which, without any compromise of supposed principle, it is now demonstrated they can unite. The passage I have quoted from Cardinal Manning is one of numerous evidences that those who hold extremely intolerant creeds are very much better than their creeds, and that what they truly believe is often much more catholic and Scriptural than what they "believe they believe." Let us hope that we are all very much better than we sometimes profess to be. We all more or less inherit the traditions and the prejudices and antipathies and shibboleths of the controversial and anarchical past; and the result is that we appear to differ even more widely than is really the case. Those of us who hope most ardently for vast and comprehensive reunions are well aware that courtship must precede marriage. As the old proverb says, "Those who marry in haste often repent at leisure." Let nothing be rushed; but let all Christian men do their utmost to co-operate with one another in every possible way. The real grounds of discord are to a much greater extent emotional than intellectual, sentimental than rational, and when we come to know one another we like one another; and it is astonishing how differences grow less and difficulties disappear under these genial circumstances. I start, therefore, with the broad principle that the ultimate reunion of Christendom is not an absolute impossibility to be dismissed at once and forever from our thoughts. I hold, with the great Christian philosopher Leibnitz, that it is a matter which should be seriously and constantly pondered. On the other hand, I fully recognize the fact that possibly hundreds of years must elapse before anything like a general reunion of Christendom comes within the range of practical ecclesiastical politics.

If reunion is ever to take place, it must be brought about by the corporate decision of the great Christian communities acting as a whole. There are some exceedingly surprising persons who imagine that they can restore the unity of Christendom by stealing individual members or families from other Christian bodies, and adding them to their own! Any one who reflects can see

that this process of gaining over supposed "heretics" or "schismatics" one by one is mathematically impossible. All the Christian communities which are regarded by some as outside the Christian Church are now numbered by millions, and no one in his sober senses can suppose that the process of stealing one here and one there can ever result in bringing these millions over. Take, for example, my own communion. There are now 30,000,000 Methodists on this planet. We are far more numerous than the Anglican Church or any other Church except the Greek and Roman. Does any one suppose for a moment that it would be possible to bring back all those millions one by one, or family by family, to the Church of which John Wesley was the minister? It is simply impossible. The largest conceivable number of such personal ecclesiastical changes does not produce the least appreciable effect upon the size of the community they leave. The attempt to proselytize individuals is simply as absurd as it is detestable, and can never succeed. We cannot blot out the world-wide effects of past history. We might as well try to drain the Lake of Geneva with a tea-cup. If anything effective is ever to be done, it must be achieved by approaching our fellow-Christians in their corporate capacity, and making proposals which are consistent with their conscientious convictions and self-respect, and which exhibit a readiness on our own part to make concessions for the sake of Jesus Christ.

I hope I have said enough to indicate that I have an open mind with respect to all reasonable proposals—that I am not wedded to any particular system or organization or method. I am prepared to concede everything except the Word of God and the spirit of Jesus Christ in order to secure the immense advantages of reunion.

The mention of the greatest of all names leads me to say, in conclusion, that I am persuaded the hindrances to reunion everywhere consist in a false definition of the "Church." So long as men, in the very teeth of history, and in contradiction to the New Testament, say, *Ubi ecclesia ibi Christus*, there is nothing before us except controversy and division. But when we are prepared to subordinate our own preferences and prejudices to facts—patent, indisputable facts—and when we are sufficiently reverent to regard the unmistakable imprimatur of God as of greater importance than the dicta of men, we shall say, *Ubi Christus ibi ecclesia*; and when this is said the reunion of Christendom is already practically achieved.

## RELATIONS OF THE CLERGY TO THE FAITH AND ORDER OF THE CHURCH.

THIRD TRIENNIAL CHARGE OF THE RT. REV.  
HENRY C. POTTER, D.D., LL.D., THE BISHOP  
OF NEW YORK.

From *The Churchman* (Epis.), New York, October 10, 1891.

*Brethren of the Clergy and Laity:—*

Though, under the provisions of the canon prescribing that duty, it is competent to the Ordinary to deliver a charge to the clergy of his diocese at his discretion, it is not usual to do so oftener than once in three years. I might well be excused, therefore, from undertaking, and you from being called on to listen to, a form of address so extended, were it not that, in the first place, such charge is declared to be proper "at least once in three years," whereas I have attempted it already but twice in an episcopate of eight years; and in the second place because it is plainly my duty to be governed by the far more important consideration of the exigency of any particular emergency in the life and work of the Church in this diocese.

Such an exigency, in my judgment, exists at present; and I shall therefore ask your attention at this time to some considerations defining the Relations of the Clergy to the Faith and Order of the Church.

In discussing this subject it is proper that I should say that in its literary form—not at all in its substance—I shall hope in some particulars to recast what follows, parts of which have been somewhat hurriedly and interruptedly written.

The relations, you will observe, of the clergy. In other words, the relations of the clergy and the laity to the Church's Faith and Order are not identical. It is a very common misapprehension to suppose that they are; and out of this misapprehension, I would remark at the outset, has come a large share of the confusion which to-day exists in men's minds with regard to the whole subject.

If we are to determine what are the relations of a layman to the faith and order of the Church, it would be proper, I should suppose, to turn to the offices of baptism, confirmation, and the Holy Communion, and to the catechism. When we do so, we find that the language which defines those relations, and determines the measure of obligation, in the matter of the Church's faith and order, of the laity, are of a very general character. How great is the liberty for the

indulgence of what, in the phrase of the Roman obedience, are called "pious opinions," it is not my province now to attempt to define; but I presume it would not be denied, for instance, that one could not be excluded from the Holy Communion because he did not accept *ex animo* Article XVII., nor because he confounded the doctrine of the Real Presence, as this Church holds and teaches the same, with the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation. Certainly, there is nothing, whether in the teaching of the Church or in her silence, to encourage, on the part of the faithful laity, indifference or ignorance as to matters of Christian doctrine or ecclesiastical order; but just as certainly she has, as had her divine Lord and Head, a large and tender charity for an imperfect and halting faith; and as the witness in the world of Him who so graciously welcomed one who could say no more than "Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief," even so, to-day, unless she is untrue to her divine commission, it is her duty to welcome, and not to repel, those who have but the slenderest grasp of the primary truths of her creeds, even though they grope and stumble amid some of the phrases in which those truths are couched.

But while this is the relation of the laity to the faith and order of the Church, the relation of the clergy is a very different, a much less indefinite, and, in one sense, a much more restricted one. For the terms of that relation are to be found not alone by reference to the sources to which already I have alluded, but also in the language of those more precise and specific obligations which are contained in the questions and answers of the various offices embraced in the Ordinal. To take a single instance as illustrative of the difference between the two classes. When an adult comes to Holy Baptism he is asked, "Do you believe all the articles of the Christian Faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed?" And if such an one, at such a point, having answered, as the office provides, "I do," should further be interrogated by some superserviceable zeal interpolating into the office its own personal opinions, "Do you accept unreservedly and literally, as scientifically true, the Biblical account of the six days of creation?" or, "Do you not reject the doctrine of a tactual succession in the ministry as a vain superstition?" and should be required to give answers in accordance with the prepossessions of his questioner, it would be entirely proper for the candidate for Holy Baptism to decline to answer questions which are, under such circumstances,

simply a  
be the  
call to  
circum  
refuse

(1) B  
date fo  
the epis  
lous ele  
authori  
faith, o  
the god  
appeal  
baptism  
question  
those fu  
obligati  
which a  
the sac  
one is c  
declarat  
"Cano  
Testam  
him to  
with re  
not pre  
both a  
him to  
tures"  
Church  
cerning  
tent to  
as well  
petent  
were co  
literatu

Agai  
priesth  
your f  
doctrin  
of Chr  
as this  
It wou  
deman  
obligat  
sacram  
minist  
that in  
the sam  
Chure  
alone  
formu  
and f  
obligat  
such c  
was o  
tion;  
ing an  
cerned  
of an  
indivi



simply a bald impertinence; even as it would be the duty of the Ordinary promptly to call to account a priest who, under such circumstances, should most unwarrantably refuse to administer Holy Baptism.

(1) But if, on the other hand, a candidate for the diaconate, the priesthood, or the episcopate, should disown the miraculous element in the four Gospels, or the authority of Holy Scripture in matters of faith, or the respect and submission due to the godly judgment of the bishop, then the appeal of such an one to the promises of his baptism would be entirely aside from the question; since to these have been added those further and more definite and specific obligations which are contained in the office which admitted him to this or that rank in the sacred ministry. For instance, when one is ordained to the diaconate he makes a declaration as to his belief concerning the "Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments," which, while it does not bind him to any particular theory of inspiration with regard to these books, and while it does not prevent him from recognizing in them both a human and divine element, does bind him to accept them as "Canonical Scriptures" set forth by the authority of the Church for the edification of its people, concerning which, while it is entirely competent to him to consider them as a literature as well as part of a revelation, it is not competent to him to deal with them as if they were committed to him merely and only as literature.

Again, in the case of one ordained to the priesthood, it is demanded, "Will you give your faithful diligence so to minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded and as this Church hath received the same?" It would seem here that an assent to this demand created at once a new and specific obligation, not alone to "minister doctrine, sacraments and discipline," but no less to minister them as—*i.e.*, in the same sense as that in which—"this Church hath received the same." And, if the sense in which this Church has received them is made plain not alone in the two creeds set forth in her formularies, but elsewhere in other offices and formularies of equal authority and obligation, then it would seem plain that such construction or understanding of them was of equal, and equally binding, obligation; and that, so far as holding, or teaching any other construction of them was concerned, one who was under the obligation of an ordination vow had parted with his individual discretion.

Yet again, and in the case of one consecrated to the office of a bishop, it is exacted that such an one shall take an oath of "conformity and obedience to the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," and this plainly denies to one under such solemn obligations the liberty to deny or disown such doctrine, discipline or worship in whatsoever particular. All these are obligations peculiar not to the laity but to the clergy. They belong to a separate class of vows, and they bind those who have made them in a way which is different, because it is so much farther-reaching and more precise than those elementary vows which are alone the conditions of ordinary Christian discipleship.

The distinction is one which, in the matter of the relations of the clergy to the faith and order of the Church is fundamental; and it is one which, if it is only held in mind, ought at once and finally to dispose of a popular form of criticism and protest, in this connection widely prevalent. In commenting upon discussions which have lately obtained elsewhere than within the Church, as to the matter of re-casting inherited formularies and confessions, it has recently been said that there are men who admit that the formularies of theology should be recast in order to bring them into closer harmony with modern life and thought, and who, nevertheless, oppose and persecute all who attempt to recast any particular formula. "To say," observes this critic, "that such an attitude is illogical, inadequately describes it. It is really immoral, and it inflicts a grievous injury upon the Church. One can respect the earnestness and consistency of the thorough-going conservative who opposes change because he believes the formula to be divinely true. But the attitude of the so-called conservative who admits the force of the arguments against traditional theology, and at the same time raises a hue and cry against those who adduce them, merits only indignation." This is popular language, but I prefer to borrow it because it sets forth a popular misapprehension in a very plausible and very intelligible way.

But plainly, its whole force turns upon the question, who are they who are adducing these arguments, whether against the traditional authority or the traditional order of the Church? What shall be the bounds of the liberty which shall be conceded to Christian scholarship and learning, outside of the ministry in this matter, I am not now called upon to define, but what ought to be those

metes and bounds in the case of men who are in Holy Orders there ought to be no doubt. The Church, for example, affirms of her divine Lord and Head that He was "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified, dead, and buried, and that the third day He rose again from the dead," and how this Church hath received the same doctrine she makes plain beyond a peradventure by such language as she uses in the collect and proper preface for Christmas Day, and in those other formulas which she sets forth for our use in connection, *e.g.*, with the special offices for Good Friday, Easter Even, Easter, and Ascension Days, and the like. Whatever indefiniteness there may have been, or may seem to have been, in any particular article of the creeds, these other formularies, which are most surely a part of the doctrine and worship of this Church,—or else she has neither—must be accepted by any one dealing honestly with his ordination vows as explicitly interpreting them. And while even these do not shut out a certain latitude of construction, *e.g.*, as to the nature of the resurrection-body, concerning which a great deal of so-called Christian and Churchly teaching has been so grossly material as to make one wonder if those who were responsible for it had ever heard of chapter xv. of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians—yet, unless those formularies may rightfully be subjected to a treatment which any candid mind, unacquainted with theological controversies, would unhesitatingly pronounce to be utterly sophistical and disingenuous, they would seem to compel from those who are pledged to hold and teach them, so long as they are willing to remain so pledged, an assent and acceptance in that sense, and only in that sense, in which universally and without question, this Church hath received the same.

I know very well to what in this age we are indebted for a very different view of ecclesiastical formularies; and we are having just now a very interesting and suggestive illustration of the way in which the theological acumen of one school and of one generation may return in another to plague its authors, when once it has been adopted by their antagonists. Among the most significant and pregnant incidents in the theological history of this century was the publication by John Henry Newman of "Tract XC." As a method of dealing with questions of doctrine raised by the Thirty-nine Articles, it had certainly the distinction of novelty; for, turning aside from the question of the authority of the Articles, it raised

the very different one of their construction, and it raised that question in order to show how they were susceptible of an interpretation of which it may with truth be said that it largely dismissed from those formularies the meaning which until then had been with practical unanimity popularly understood to be the reason for their existence. In other words, the Articles had been commonly supposed to be designed to set forth the essential distinction, in the matter of those doctrines of which they treated, between Anglican and Roman teaching. It remained for Dr. Newman to show to an astonished communion that the apparently contradictory positions of the two communions could be reconciled.

It was the remarkable intellectual feat of an extraordinary mind,—a mind of which a great archbishop who was contemporaneous with Newman wrote, many years afterward, "I have always regarded Newman as having a strange duality of mind. On the one side is a wonderfully strong and subtle reasoning faculty, on the other a . . . faith, ruled almost entirely by his emotions. It seems to me that, in all matters of belief, he first acts on his emotions, and then he brings the subtilty of his reason to bear, till he has ingeniously persuaded himself that he is logically right."\*

But in Newman's case it did not take a great while for the brilliant author of Tract XC. to find that such methods as it illustrated brought with them no rest to a perplexed conscience; and the originator of them ere long withdrew from a ministry whose obligations he could no longer reconcile with the change in his own beliefs. It was the most honorable, as it was doubtless the most painful, act of his life.

But the results of a man's acts reach a great way beyond his practical repudiation of them; and to-day there are persons who never read Tract XC.—if they ever heard of it—who have come to regard it as an admitted principle that one may accept an ecclesiastical formula and maintain his position as an ecclesiastical teacher, under conditions in which he is largely engaged in employing his office, in order to read into formularies meanings which, in all the history of their development and formation, were wholly foreign to the minds of their compilers.

And this it is which has created in candid and ingenuous minds, whatever their religious beliefs, the gravest apprehensions. If it is supposed that these apprehensions

\* Life of Archbishop Tait, vol. i., p. 89.

are shal  
ly conse  
liefs, su  
mark.  
day w  
this or  
in whic  
it. A  
ecclesi  
lately s  
all our  
various  
enough  
research  
shastica  
howeve  
class is  
remain  
repudi  
It is a  
the ar  
sion to  
in the  
that,  
fact,  
the c  
The d  
contin  
I am  
It con  
it is n  
of on  
This  
we an  
point  
eccles  
it or  
that  
a con  
rity.  
subm  
The  
befor  
After  
hand  
a ma  
has  
galle  
deny  
men  
and  
sym  
long  
mus  
ing  
acco  
con  
thin  
und  
men  
to

are shared only by those who are tenaciously conservative of old and long-accepted beliefs, such an impression is quite beside the mark. There are a great many people to-day who are concerned not so much as to this or that belief as they are with the way in which its accepted guardians deal with it. A critic of public affairs, both civil and ecclesiastical, of exceptional ability, has lately said: "We do not need to say that all our sympathies are with the men in various communions who are open-minded enough to see how the new wine of modern research is hopelessly bursting the old ecclesiastical wine-skins. . . . One position, however, assumed by some persons of this class is . . . that a minister may honorably remain in the service of a Church, though repudiating leading articles of its creed. . . . It is acknowledged that no man rejecting the articles in question could obtain admission to the ministry of the particular body in the first instance. Still it is maintained that, once in, he may rightfully stay; in fact, that it is his duty to stay and reform the creed according to his notions. . . . The defence put forward for this position," continues the secular authority from which I am quoting, "will not bear examination. It consists, in the first place, in saying that it is monstrously absurd for the creed-makers of one age to bind the thinkers of the next. This is the worst form of the 'dead-hand' we are told. But all this is aside from the point. The 'dead-hand' system is a fact in ecclesiastical organizations, whether we like it or not. Its legal sanctions are admitted; that is unquestionable. It is the only way a communion has of maintaining its integrity. . . . And no man is called upon to submit himself to it with his eyes shut. The minister has the situation clearly put before him at his ordination, and accepts it. After thus deliberately accepting the 'dead-hand' system, what sort of a spectacle does a man present railing at its hardships? He has put the yoke on his own neck; if it galls, let him throw it off; but let him not deny the existence of the yoke. . . . If men belong to a Church which has officially and publicly declared that the historical symbols are not regarded seriously any longer, even though nominally retained, we must absolve the ministers, while condemning the Church. But if they have seriously accepted the creed of a religious body which continues to take its creed seriously; and think they can flout it while still serving under it, we can only say that the mass of men will regard that as an immoral thing to do."

I beg to remind you again, dear brethren, that these are the words of a purely secular observer of the present theological situation, given to the world in a purely secular organ of public opinion. I believe that they reflect the judgments of sober and honest minds with respect to the specific and exceptional obligations of the ministry in the matter of the Church's faith, not alone among ourselves but everywhere; and they do so because there are judgments and convictions imbedded in the moral consciousness of all honest men. In another hemisphere, a very eminent authority in the world of letters, looking at the same questions from another point of view, has lately said: "Supposing a trust fund had been created for the purpose of expounding the beauties of Wordsworth, should we quite approve of a lecturer who accepted the stipend and devoted a good deal of energy to the skilful depreciation of Wordsworth? . . . We believe that the ground idea of revelation is absolutely true, and has been the security for the only mental and moral freedom the race has enjoyed. And we must say that we think the opposite view, if it is to be urged with sincerity and consistency at all, should be urged by men who are not continually using liturgies which imply the very creeds they are denouncing, and offering up prayers which are pure mockeries unless God has really manifested Himself specially in Jewish history, and become incarnate in one human career equally majestic and submissive. Some day the close of this century will be described as the time when the heterodox thinkers began to fulminate against the orthodox, and Christians were almost treated as excommunicate, not because they believed less than they said, but because they did not regard their worship as a mere form of words of which the significance had to be carefully watered down until it became hardly significance at all." \*

But it may be asked at this point, Is, then, one who is honestly perplexed concerning questions which touch the fundamental verities of the faith to stifle those perplexities, and to go on teaching or affirming as truth certain things concerning which he is no longer persuaded that they are the truth, but is rather, it may be, profoundly persuaded that they are not the truth? Is uniformity of teaching to be maintained at the cost of honest inquiry? Is a past pledge to bind a present conscience, whose old attitude to the thing once affirmed, it may have

\* *The Spectator*, London, August 15, 1891.

been with the most absolute sincerity, is now wholly changed? Can any obligation of consistency warrant the maintenance of one attitude, outwardly, which is the expression of no inmost conviction?

These are entirely reasonable questions, but it is the misfortune of our time that, in the case of those who ask them, they are assumed to be susceptible of only one answer, and that an answer which justifies a line of action that accepts and uses the formulary in one breath and then, while retaining the office which imposes it, disowns its authority with the other. It would seem that by any candid mind dealing with the subject without predisposing prejudice, such a conclusion must be owned to be simply grotesque.

But what, then, it may be further demanded, is the duty of one in Holy Orders who cannot accept the faith, or conform to the order of the Church whose minister he is? Is he to throw up his commission, and retreat from his office, and abandon the communion of the Church of which he is a member? I am by no means prepared to say that any such constraint is laid upon him, or, if it is, that it is a course which should be resorted to, save as a last and most sorrowful extremity. But I am no less clear that in such a case, in the case, *e.g.* (for I have in this matter a strong desire to be as precise and specific as I can), of one who has parted with a faith in the supernatural element in the Holy Scriptures or in the person and work of Christ, it is the plain duty of such an one to suspend his ministrations, and temporarily, at any rate, to retire from the exercise of his sacred office, and address himself with prayer and abstinence, and most searching and candid inquiry, to an examination of the question or questions at issue. And I maintain, further, that it is pre-eminently his duty, at every step of such inquiry, to bring his impressions or conclusions to the bar of the Church's consistent and unvarying teaching, and to try and test what disturbs him by her clear voice, as that voice has spoken unfalteringly from the beginning. There is a large contempt in our time for patristic teaching, but we need not deify that teaching in order to demonstrate that, while much of it was undoubtedly local and temporary in its character, there runs through it consistently a clear stream of testimony to the person and work of Jesus Christ and to the divine order of the Holy Catholic Church, which no wise man will hastily disesteem.

But, if neither this nor any other voice

can answer the questions or relieve the perplexities of such an one as I have imagined, then I am unable to see how honestly his work, his office and he can do otherwise than part company. It is of course competent to any one in the ministry of the Church, who may desire, from her councils or otherwise, an interpretation of her teachings, to ask for it; but so long as that teaching remains so plainly what it is, his liberty while in the ministry ends there. If any one among us thinks otherwise—if any class of men in Holy Orders shall ever be seen with one hand pulling down the very pillars of the temple, while with the other they are seeking to grasp every honor, dignity, and emolument which pertains to their office—and if the Church, whose servants they are, shall tolerate so monstrous an inconsistency, then one is compelled to say that the one and the other will equally deserve, even though they may not receive, the scorn and contempt of all honorable men. Again, let me say that I do not forget the ecclesiastical sophistry in which this very prevalent misconception began; but when it is considered that much that is heard in the way of a destructive criticism would have little or no weight were it not for the surroundings amid which it is uttered—and when it is further considered that the present is a situation which has almost more than any other given the enemy occasion to blaspheme, it cannot be wondered that it has provoked not alone profound grief and dismay, but also, and equally, a keen and righteous resentment!

But, dear brethren, we who would defend the Church's faith and order must see to it that in doing so we are not provoked to either extravagance or unreason. And it is my duty to say that just here at present there lies a great, if not our greatest, danger. It is characteristic of all periods of alarm that they exaggerate the proportions of the impending peril; and it is to be remembered that there are apt to be those who will not be slow to use such exaggerations in the interest of particular, and often very insufficiently authorized statements or definitions of the Church's teaching, in order to justify action which is equally intolerant and unjust. Let me indicate more explicitly what I mean. It is not uncommon nowadays, to hear the statement deliberately uttered that the minds of a large proportion of the clergy are honeycombed with error, and corrupted with false doctrines. It is by no means unusual to hear it affirmed that there is an equally prevalent disesteem for the order and ministry of the Church,

as seen  
the prac

Well,  
venture  
my own  
for the  
the lar  
constan  
under o  
majorit  
are con  
unreser  
on in  
York,  
occasio  
presum  
such g  
to are  
Individ  
irregul  
always  
great c  
and re  
advert  
dental  
subsist  
that c  
in tea  
to trea  
other  
thing  
the g  
began  
ago, I  
servat  
which  
preval  
day,  
Chur  
The  
ment  
time  
spirit  
to cli  
the  
forgo  
liber  
serve  
that  
lieve  
mati  
disti  
the  
the  
and  
turn  
thee  
ed t  
the  
has  
cler



as seen in the conduct of her services and the practice of her clergy.

Well, I presume that while I cannot at all venture to speak for those who are without my own jurisdiction, I may venture to speak for those who are within it. For much of the larger part of ten years, I have been constantly going in and out among them under conditions which I presume the great majority of them will bear me out in saying are conditions of considerable and habitual unreserve. If anybody knows what is going on in the parishes of the diocese of New York, whatever might be the adroitness of occasional or individual concealments, I presume that I do; and I beg to say that such general imputations as I have referred to are absolutely and utterly unwarranted. Individual eccentricities, extravagances, irregularities, undoubtedly there are, and always will be. Occurring in and about a great centre, they will always attract notice and receive extensive and wholly gratuitous advertisement,—on which last, it may incidentally be observed, such things largely subsist. But it is one thing to note this or that extravagance or eccentricity, whether in teaching or worship, and quite another to treat it as in any wise representative, or other than the isolated and exceptional thing that it is. I remember very vividly the growing surprise with which, when I began going about in the diocese eight years ago, I took note of the almost universal conservatism both in doctrine and in order which I encountered. It is distinctly the prevalent note in our diocesan situation today, as I believe it to be in that American Church of which the diocese is a part.

The present is not, therefore, in my judgment, a time for alarm, much less is it a time for an illustration of that reactionary spirit, which in its almost passionate desire to cling to certain traditions that are purely the fruit of a very modern Protestantism forgets its Catholic heritage and its Catholic liberty. A very modern Protestantism, observe, I say, for I do not know anything that is more important for those who believe, as I certainly believe, that the Reformation contained something good, than to distinguish, for instance, in the matter of the authority of Holy Scripture, between the Protestantism of Milton and Luther, and that of their modern heirs who are in turn the inheritors of American Puritan theology. How far that theology has affected the minds of Churchmen (many of them the descendants of a Puritan ancestry) and has expressed itself in the teaching of our clergy in regard, *e.g.*, to the Bible, I should

not like to undertake to say. But it is time that in that connection it was distinctly affirmed that the Bible includes both a human element and a divine element, and that it is entirely competent for any one in Holy Orders, whether bishop, priest or deacon, to say so, and if so, at any rate to inquire how the two elements may be distinguished and to avail himself of every adequate aid in the conduct of such an inquiry. There are those on the one hand who maintain that that literature which we call the Bible contains no divine element, and there are those on the other who maintain that it contains no human element. It is high time that it was said, and said with unmistakable explicitness, that neither of these positions is the position of the Church. If it is, then it behooves those who say so to point out where the Church has ecumenically said so. But as a matter of fact, as surely I need not remind those to whom I now speak, this is simply and utterly impossible. The Church has not anywhere, nor at any time committed herself to any dogmatic definition of the meaning of inspiration, and whatever particular sects or schools may have attempted to do in this direction is wholly aside from the question. Indeed, as has lately been forcibly pointed out, "it is remarkable that Origen's almost reckless mysticism \* and his accompanying repudiation of large parts of the narrative of the Old Testament and of some parts of the New, though it did not gain acceptance, and indeed had no right to it (for it had no sound basis); on the other hand never aroused the Church to contrary definitions. Nor is it only Origen who disputed the historical character of parts of the narrative of Holy Scripture. Clement before him in Alexandria, and the mediæval Anselm in the West, treat the seven days of creation as an allegory and not history. Athanasius speaks of paradise as 'a figure,' and a mediæval Greek writer, who had more of Irenæus than remains to us, declares that he did not know how those who kept to the letter and took the account of the Temptation historically rather than allegorically could meet the arguments of Irenæus against them.

"The Church, then, is not tied by any existing definition as to inspiration. We cannot make any exact claim upon any one's belief in regard to inspiration, simply because we have no authoritative definition to bring to bear upon him. Those of us who believe most in the inspiration of the Church will see a divine providence in this absence

\* Origen De Principiis, iv. 15. 16, 17.

of dogma, because we shall perceive that only now is the state of knowledge such as admits of the question being legitimately raised." \*

And meantime, it ought to comfort those to whom its discussion is most alarming because so entirely unfamiliar, to be reminded that, after all, that which is the office of much of modern criticism that does not aim simply to be destructive, was equally the aim of those fathers of the Church whose teachings we are rightly enjoined ought to be had in reverence among us. "Thus St. Gregory of Nazianzus," as the writer whom I have already quoted points out, "speaking of God's dealings with the Jews of old, describes how, in order to gain the co-operation of man's good will in working for his recovery, He dealt after the manner of a school-master of a physician, and while curtailing part or their ancestral customs, tolerated the rest, making some concession to their tastes just as physicians make their medicines palatable that they may be taken by their patients. . . . Hence the first law, while it abolished their sacrifices, allowed them to be circumcised; then, when once they had accepted the removal of what was taken from them, they went further and gave up what had been conceded to them—in the first case, their sacrifices, and in the second their practice of circumcision—and they became instead of heathens, Jews, instead of Jews, Christians, being betrayed, as it were, by gradual changes into acceptance of the Gospel. Again St. Chrysostom explains how it is the very merit of the Old Testament that it has taught us to think things intolerable which under it were tolerated. 'Do not ask,' he says, 'how these Old Testament precepts can be good now when the need for them is past; ask how they were good when the period required them. Or, rather, if you wish, do inquire into their merit, even now. It is still conspicuous, and lies in nothing so much as what now enables us to find fault with them. Their highest praise is that we now see them to be defective.' " †

And plainly, if it was competent for patristic criticism thus to discriminate between the temporary and the permanent, the human and divine elements in the substance of Holy Scripture, it is competent for a reverent criticism to do the same thing as to the letter of it now. "Inspiration," it has pertinently been declared, "means the illumination of the judgment of the recorder." "By the contact of the Holy

Spirit," says Origen, "they became clearer in their mental perception, and their souls were filled with a brighter light." \* "But have we any reason," asks Mr. Gore, "to believe that inspiration means over and above this, the miraculous communication of facts not otherwise to be known, a miraculous communication such as would make the recorder independent of the ordinary processes of historical tradition? Certainly neither St. Luke's preface to his Gospel, nor the evidence of any inspired record justifies this assertion," and just as certainly "the Church repudiated the Montanist conception of inspiration according to which the inspired man speaks as the passive instrument of the Spirit;" to which it may be added, as pointed out by Epiphanius in an earlier age, and by Westcott and Mason in our own, that "metaphors which describe the Holy Spirit as acting upon a man 'like a flute player breathing into his flute,' or 'a plectrum striking a lyre,' have always a suspicion attaching to their use of heresy." †

And, if so, then another view of the Bible, at once more catholic and more defensible, cannot be denied to those who find in it their surest road to an intelligent and impregnable position with reference to the Holy Scripture. Nay more, it needs, I think, with much plainness to be said that those who are striving with a loyalty to Catholic tradition and with a tenderness and reverence for Holy Scripture, which is only greater than their tenderness and consideration for their fellow-believers, to find a basis of reconciliation between historic criticism and the inherited faith of the Church are doing a work for which they greatly deserve to be had in lasting and grateful remembrance. The want of our time, we are told, is for something which, amid the vagueness, the uncertainty, the contradictoriness of the thousand voices which assail us shall speak with definiteness. Yes, it is, but it is no less, nay, even more, I think, something which shall speak with discrimination. One of the small but courageous and reverent group of men to whom I have already referred observes with singular pertinency, just here, "In the truths which the Church teaches, we may distinguish two classes. First there are the central truths to which it bears absolute witness, such as the Fatherhood of God, the person and work of Jesus Christ, the redemption of all mankind, the origin and purpose of human life. These it teaches

\* Gore, *The Holy Spirit and Inspiration*, pp. 357, 358.

† Gregory Nazianzus, *Orat.* xxx. 25.

\* Origen contra Celsum, vii. 4.

† Gore, *Holy Spirit and Inspiration*, p. 343.

authoritatively. Its conduct is exactly analogous to a parent teaching the moral law to its children; teaching the commandments at first, till the child can be educated to understand the reason of them. So the Church says to her children, or to those who are seeking after truth, there is an absolute truth in religion as well as in morality; we have tested it; generations of the saints have found it true. It is a truth independent of individual teachers; independent of the shifting moods of opinion at any particular period, and you must accept it on our authority first. Further, these truths affect life, and they cannot be apprehended merely by the intellect. You must commit yourself to them; act upon them; there is a certain time when the seeker after truth sees where it lies; then it must cease to be an open question." You must, in the words of Tertullian, "seek till you find, but when you have once found truth, you must commit yourself to it."\* You must believe that you may understand, but it is *that* you may understand! The dogma is authoritatively taught that the individual may be kept safe from mere individual caprice and fancifulness, but also that he himself may come to a rational understanding of his belief. No doubt the truth is so wide that, to the end of our lives, we shall still feel the need of guidance and of teaching. . . . Like St. Ignatius on his way to martyrdom, the Christian may feel at his dying day, "Now I begin to be a disciple," but the aim of the Church is to make each member have a rational hold upon his faith. When we are young we accept a doctrine because the Church teaches it to us; when we are grown up, we love the Church because it taught us the doctrine. "The Churchman," as Principal Hawkins has said in his sermons on the Church,† "never surrenders his individual responsibility. But he may and must surrender some portion at least of his independence and he benefits greatly by the surrender."

"Submission to the authority of the Church is the merging of our mere individualism in the whole historic life of the great Christian brotherhood; it is making ourselves at one with the one religion in its most permanent and least mere local form. It is surrendering our individuality only to empty it of its narrowness."‡

"Secondly, there are other truths which are rather deductions from these central points, or statements of them in accordance

with the needs of the age; such as the mode of the relation of the divine and human nature in Christ, or free will, or predestination, or the method of the Atonement, or the nature of the inspiration of Holy Scripture. If, in any case, a point of this kind has consciously come before the whole Church and been reasoned out and been decided upon, such a decision raises it to the higher class of truths which are taught authoritatively: but if this is not so, the matter remains an open question. It remains a question for theologians, it is not imposed on individuals, though it may at any time become ripe for decision. The very fixity of the great central doctrines allows the Church to give a remarkable freedom to individual opinion on all other points. Practically, how much wider is the summary of the rule of faith as given in Irenæus (III. 4) or Tertullian (Præser. 13) or Origen (De Principiis) or in the Apostles' or Nicene Creed, than the tests of orthodoxy that would be imposed in a modern religious circle!

St. Vincent of Perins is the great champion of antiquity as the test of truth, yet it is he who also insists on the duty of development, of growth, within the lines of the central truths. . . . "As the time goes on," he says, "it is right that the old truths should be elaborated, polished, filed down. . . . They should be made clear, have light thrown upon them, be marked off from each other, but they must not lose their fullness, their entirety, their essential character."\*

"So it has happened in the course of the Christian history; doctrines like that of the Atonement have been restated afresh to meet the needs of the age. So it is happening still; doctrines like that of the method of creation, or the limits of inspiration, are still before the Church. The Church is slow to decide, to formulate, it stands aside, it reiterates its central truths, it says that whatever claims to be discovered must ultimately fit in with the central truths; Creation must remain God's work; the Bible must remain God's revelation of Himself; but for a time it is content to wait, loyal to fact, from whatever side it comes; confident alike in the many-sidedness and in the unity of the truth. While he accepts and while he searches, the Churchman can enjoy alike the inquiry of truth, which is the wooing of it, the knowledge of the truth which is the presence of it, and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying of

\* Tertullian, Præser. 9: *Quærendum est donec inventus et credendum ubi inveniatis.*

† Page 77. ‡ C. Gore, Roman Catholic Claims, p. 51.

\* St. Vincent of Lerins, *Communitorium* ix. and xxiii.

it, and all these together, says Lord Bacon\* are the sovereign good of human nature."†

(2) And as of the Church's faith so of the Church's Order, and of the relation of those who are her ministers to the observance of that order. As to the institution of the order, government, and ministry of the Church, there has not in all ages been one opinion, nor is it likely that there ever will be. The language which in the Ordinal prefaces the offices of ordination declares that "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons: which offices were evermore held in such reverent estimation that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same, and also by public prayer with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority."

You and I, dear brethren, most of us, know what we understand by these words and what may with strictest truth be said to have been the prevalent understanding of them in all ages of the Church. Despite the ridicule which has been widely cast upon the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession (a ridicule, it must be owned, often provoked by the arrogance of those pretensions which have too frequently accompanied it, and the want of Christian courtesy or charity with which its claims have been urged), the great mass of Churchmen, I am disposed to think, accept the authority of an apostolic ministry, with a due and substantially unbroken succession and continuity, as in accordance with the facts of history and the wants of men. They are not greatly disturbed by the crimes of popes, or the corruptions of councils. They have seen the power of the Church, in one part, if not in every part, to purge itself of error and to return humbly and reverently to the purity and simplicity of primitive doctrine and of primitive order. And as in nature one has seen the electric current overleap a break in the twisted wire along which it flashes, and fly onwards on its swift and enkindling errand, through further reaches of the same far-travelling agency, so they have seen the primitive and apostolic graces pierce their way through glooms of error and shame, and overleap the gaps in neglected order or discipline, and speed on those heavenly errands of healing

and light on which the Church, Catholic and Apostolic, now as of old, is hastening. That those gifts and graces manifest themselves nowhere else and under no other conditions than within her fold, who are they that shall presume to affirm? "In those ever open portals" (of the kingdom of God) says Dr. Pusey in his "Responsibility of the Intellect in Matters of Faith"—"In those ever open portals there enter that countless multitude whom the Church knew not how to win, or, alas! neglected to win them." But the question is not whether within or without the Church, Catholic and apostolic both in its doctrine and ministry, there are the richest manifestations of divine grace or of human saintship. It is another and very different question that we have to deal with—a very dry and uninteresting, because largely unintelligible question, to multitudes of exemplary people (and that simply because they have never chosen to see it in its relation to the revealed mind and ordering of the Head of the Church in the matter of the foundations of a Christian society), and that is the question whether the ministry has not always "advanced upon the principle of succession, so that whatever functions a man held at any time were simply those that had been committed to him by some one among his predecessors who held the authority to give orders by regular devolution from the apostles."\*

There are many of us, and I am quite free to say that I find myself among them, who are quite sufficiently clear for all practical purposes on this point. "It was," says Stanton in his work on the Christian Ministry historically considered, "a law, as it were, of the being of the Church that it should put on this (the three-fold or episcopal) form of organization—a law which worked as surely as the growth of a particular kind of plant from a particular kind of seed. Everywhere there was a development which made unerringly for the same good. This seems to speak of divine institution almost as plainly as if our Lord had in so many words prescribed this form of Church government. He, the Founder, the Creator of the Church, would seem to have impressed upon it this nature."

Says Mr. Gore, referring to this language, "Mr. Darwin, writing about his theory of the process of evolution in nature, uses these words, 'I fully admit that there are very many difficulties not satisfactorily explained by my theory of descent with modi-

\* Bacon, *Essay on Truth*.

† The Rev. Walter Locke, *The Church*, pp. 387-9.

\* Gore, *The Christian Ministry*, p. 313.



fication; but I cannot possibly believe that a false theory would explain so many classes of facts as I think it certainly does explain. On these grounds I drop my anchor, and believe that the difficulties will slowly disappear." \* "It is interesting to notice," continues Mr. Gore, "what grounds of evidence a great scientific teacher thinks adequate to support a far-reaching doctrine; and it is impossible not to perceive what infinitely higher grounds we have for our theory of the Apostolic Succession. It not only explains many classes of facts, but it, and it only (though of course the cogency of the positive evidence for it is different at different stages), appears to explain all the phenomena of the Christian ministry from the beginning. We, then, have better cause to drop our anchor." † For one, I profoundly believe that we have, and I am glad of the opportunity to relieve the possible apprehensions of some perturbed brethren by saying so.

But when I have, there is something more that still remains to be said. There is a view of the ministry which is held by some of the clergy and by more, I presume, of the laity of this Church, which is quite a different one. It explains its three-fold character as the result of circumstances,—providential circumstances most surely, since, as a matter of fact, to a Christian mind there can be no other,—rather than as a matter of specific divine purpose and institution. It holds the episcopate to be necessary indeed to the completeness of the Church but not, certainly, to its existence; or, to put it in a familiar way, as necessary to its well-being, but not, absolutely, to its being. It holds the episcopate to be distinguishable from the presbyterate, rather by a law of convenience than by any higher law. And it carries out these opinions more or less explicitly to their logical conclusions, in its judgments of the divisions of Christendom, and in its relations to those who represent them.

I am not one of those who have been able to find in such views any sufficient warrant in Holy Scripture or in Christian history; and I am quite free to say that the latest effort to enforce them in the very able and brilliant lectures of Dr. Hatch seems to me to involve the grave peril of proving a great deal too much. It is difficult, in other words, to see how an argument which derives the organic form of the Church from the coincidence of local circumstances, and largely, if not completely, eliminates the

element of a divine and convenient ordering and purpose, might not with equal appropriateness be applied not merely to questions of order but to questions of doctrine. But, on the other hand, that it is not competent for one in Holy Orders in this Church to hold and affirm views of the origin and character of its three-fold ministry such as I have just indicated, can only be alleged of one who is grossly ignorant, whether of the history of the Church of England or of our own, or deliberately determined to misrepresent both. The effort which we have lately seen in this Church to defeat the confirmation of an eminent presbyter elected to the episcopate, and to defeat it by methods which, in the judgment of all decent people, ought to redound to the lasting dishonor of those who employ them, was an effort ostensibly to compass that defeat on grounds of theological unsoundness, but really, so far as it had any respectable championship, because the individual concerned did not happen to hold a prevalent view of the Apostolic Succession. It does not seem to have occurred to such persons that a different view was long held by the venerated and saintly man who was, for the first fifty years of its history, the presiding bishop of this Church, and that William White was by no means the only presiding bishop that held such a view. It seems quite as little to have occurred to them that, if such a view be a positive disqualification for the episcopate, it would have excluded scores of men from the House of Bishops, some of whom have lent to it much the noblest lustre with which it has ever shone. It does not seem to have occurred to them, either, that what is true of the American is quite as true of the Anglican Church. Least of all does it seem to have occurred to them that this endeavor to force the view of one party or school as a finality upon the whole Church is simply so much partisan insolence. But it is high time that at least that much did occur to them! We may regret, dear brethren, as I am quite free to say I do, that any man called to a high and sacred office does not see its sanctions and trace its authority along the lines that seem so clear to us. But an intelligent recognition of the relations of the clergy to questions of ecclesiastical order in our time demands that we must recognize the liberty, as well as the limitations, which pertain to every man among them.

And here I desire to say that I do not forget those limitations as they are indicated in the canonical legislation of this Church, and that I am glad of the oppor-

\* Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, II., p. 217.

† Gore, *The Christian Ministry*, pp. 343-4.

tunity to say to the clergy of this diocese that the Church's law in this particular is on the whole, in my judgment, both wise and timely. That law, as you will remember, is stated in Canon 14 and in Canon 22 of Title I. of the Digest, and its object, plainly enough, is to protect the people committed to our charge from unauthorized or erroneous teaching. Undoubtedly there are times when its rigid application may seem to some of us to deny to Church people too much, and to deprive us of the edification of teachers who make no claim to hold the orders of this Church, but who have nevertheless won wide and respectful recognition as being in the true spiritual succession of the prophets of an elder time. I can very well understand that feeling, though I have never at any period in my own ministry found myself seriously tempted to yield to it, being persuaded, I must own, that it was open to the suspicion of being of scant courtesy to those to whom it seemed to extend courtesy, and,—quite apart from the question of its canonical irregularity,—of doubtful edification to those for whose benefit it was designed. I can very well understand, also, how, for example, the spectacle of the appearance of one who made no claim to any ministerial ordination or commission whatever, and whose fellowship denied to all infants the saving grace of Holy Baptism, as a public teacher, in the cathedral church of another diocese than our own, might create a good deal of confusion in the minds of well-meaning and kindly disposed clergy, eager to reach out a brotherly hand to Christians of other names around us. But even a spectacle resembling this, sporadic, exceptional, and wholly unlikely to provoke general or even occasional imitation, has not seemed to me a sufficient reason for invoking the penalties of the law of the Church,—even if I could persuade myself that as the judge in these matters of my brethren it could ever be my duty to set the Church's penal machinery in motion.

If, however, in this I shall hereafter see reason—as I have not yet seen—to believe myself mistaken, it is proper that I should say here publicly, what I have had occasion already to say privately, that if the prohibitions of Canon 14 of Title I. are to be invoked in one direction, they could not with any propriety be withheld from application in another. We have had Greeks and Armenians and Old Catholics, not only preaching from the pulpits, but celebrating at the altars of some of our most venerable churches and chapels. No one of these per-

sons was “licensed or ordained according to” our canons, nor were all of them (as, for example, those of the Greek or Russian Church) in any sense “communicants of this Church.” Nay, more, the hospitable and charitable invitations to those persons to perform their services in our sanctuaries,—invitations which the Catholic heart of the whole Church has applauded, fall, and that by the strictest and most liberal construction, within the express prohibitions, not of one, but of two, canons of the Church. Such ecclesiastics were not, as I have said, “licensed or ordained to minister in this Church,” and, unhappily, they could not be called “communicants of this Church,” yet they were invited to “officiate” and “minister” in unequivocal “acts of sacerdotal function,”—and not only so, but, “in performing such service” they were expected and intended to use “other prayers than those prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer.” I do not see how, under a rigid rule of construction, the conclusion can be avoided that these most charitable invitations were in direct contravention of the plain prohibitions of Canon 14 of Title I. and also of Section 1 of Canon 22 of the same Title. And it must be obvious that, if the penal machinery of the Church is to be set in operation for the punishment of one class of offences, under the canons above referred to, it cannot stop this side of its application to another (and in one aspect of them) more flagrant set of offences under the same canons, simply because they who have invoked the canon do not wish it to punish offenders with whom they themselves happen to be in sympathy.

Nay, more, dear brethren, it is my duty to remind you that all these things belong to a still larger class of things done by the clergy of various schools and tendencies, which men of other schools hold to be contrary to the plain order of this Church, and which undoubtedly are thus contrary. Obviously, if we are to enter upon a course of discipline toward one class, we must not linger to initiate it toward another, and, just as plainly, we must persist in attempting to accomplish by the application of penal discipline what, in the long run, can only be accomplished by lifting the standard of personal loyalty and deepening in the individual consciences of the clergy a reverence for the Church's voice of authority.

But in saying this let me not be misunderstood. It is commonly supposed,—at least I am often told so,—that I am keenly averse to ecclesiastical trials among us. I am quite free to say that, under the present law of

this Church, I shall very reluctantly initiate one, for I confess that to expect, as in some aspects of our present canons they seem to, that the Ordinary shall serve as grand jury, prosecuting attorney, and judge, all in one, is simply a legal absurdity. But if the clergy want their brethren tried, let me say plainly that they must be willing in each case to get behind the indictment and shoulder the responsibility of bringing accusations,—accusations which too many of them are ready enough to repeat, but a little more ready to disown when explicitly they are called to account for them. When they do that, they will discover, as some of them have already discovered, that the machinery of the law will be set in motion quite as promptly as they could desire.

But indeed, as I have already implied, whether it is or not, is, as our canon law stands at present, a matter of very little consequence. When a diocesan court has done its utmost to punish an offender, it is only a diocesan court after all. What is heterodoxy to-day in one jurisdiction may be pronounced by some other court in another to be orthodoxy to-morrow; and until the Church provides some ultimate Court of Appeal in matters of Faith and Order, diocesan decisions upon either point will absolutely determine nothing.

"Very well, then," it may be said, "if the law cannot help us, there is left at least the refuge of petition, of protest, of remonstrance. Yes, and it is a most sacred refuge. Palsied be the hand that would seek to rob even the feeblest of us of it! But when it is invoked it would be well, as I think you will agree with me, that it should be so employed as at least to seem to recognize the simplest laws of courtesy. It is not my purpose here to speak of the contents of a certain remonstrance signed by some of the clergy of this diocese last spring, simply because the history of the whole business makes that impossible. I am not, I think it will be owned, a stickler for official prerogatives, and I fancy there are very few persons in the episcopal office who are accustomed to treat such questions with more profound indifference,—an indifference which I have lately had occasion to apprehend has led some persons to suppose that they need not consider the ordinary and reasonable civilities of either personal or official intercourse. It is the first time, I apprehend, in the history of this Church, that a bishop has come to know of the contents of a communication addressed exclusively to himself, by finding it in the columns of a newspaper, and it will be the only

time, I hope, in the history of the Church that a bishop's only information of such a communication shall be of so irresponsible a nature. Indeed, I cannot suppose that any clergyman or any body of clergymen could otherwise than very hastily imagine that a bishop could consent to take notice of a document authenticated to him, not only by no responsible signature, but by no signature whatever. "I find it sometimes easier," said a great French archbishop, "to make my clergy proficient in theology than in filial and fraternal courtesy." I am glad to believe, dear brethren, that in these latter graces no one of us would willingly be deficient.

But in the matter of the relations of the clergy to the faith and order of the Church there is one thing in which we all need instruction, and with a reference to that, I may well close this discussion. It is a very natural instinct of human nature, and it has been, alas, a very pre-eminent distinction of people who have supremely arrogated to themselves the title of theologians to crush out opinions that, upon whatever question, do not happen to accord with their own. But it is an instinct as ignoble as it is common, and, more than that, it is one the triumph of which would be scarcely less fatal to the true life and growth of the Church than the widest prevalence of error. In a body which, while, as we rejoice to believe, under divine guidance and inspiration, is still made up of very frail and faulty members, led by very fallible and often very imperfectly formed guides, no graver or more perilous situation could come to pass than that in which the due proportion of the faith and the due balance of opposite aspects of the one truth were no longer maintained by the differing and sometimes apparently dissonant voices of its teachers. The moment that we have affirmed the one truth we are bound to affirm that there are, and rightly ought to be, various standpoints from which to look at it. There are those to whom, constitutionally, such a statement is intolerable; but that does not alter the fact. And, because it is the fact, the Church's duty in our time is clear. We want defenders of the Church's liberty, as well as of the Church's orthodoxy, and we want on this point, on the part of the episcopate, a candor in leadership which honest men have, from those who are over them, a right to look for. There is a divine doctrine, but let us take care that in defining it we do not make it narrower than Christ Himself has made it! There is a divine order, but let us not seek only so inexorably

to enforce it that, like those iron images of the middle ages, it shall crush the life out of the victim whom it embraces. The question for us who are ministers of this Church is how the two sides of its truth are to be united in that kind of Churchmanship which shall stand for all the sanctities of the individual soul in the sanctity of the Church itself, as the very institution of sacredness,—holy in its government, in its rites, in its creeds, because only in and by these can the very idea of holiness, or wholeness, be maintained; and therefore, insisting on this supreme holiness in its unity, its hierarchy, its worship, and its faith, while never losing sight of the fact that the ground of all holiness is in reason, and that reason must be respected in its freedom, lest truth shall be untruly believed, and loyalty be disloyally given, and worship be paid by an unworshipping heart. Authority is not its own end. Parentage is not for the sake of parentage. The end of parentage is that the child may be a man. The end of authority is spiritual freedom. To-day the Church and civilization by the Church have reached the period where the child is nearing manhood, where authority must justify itself, where the reason of man must find itself in the reason of the Church, and so feel free while obeying that reason as, in the truest sense, its own. . . . Authority and reason, order and freedom, spirit and form, this is the true definition of the Catholic Church, and of the Churchmanship which our times want—because all times want it! Under the dominion of such a spirit self-will will distrust itself, and the reason of one be qualified and ennobled by the larger reason of the whole; and under it most of all, our ministry—yours and mine, my reverend brethren—will become a ministry of reconciliation, reconciling the past and the present, the Church and the individual; the soul and God. May God hasten that day!

### PROOFS OF AN HISTORIC EPISCOPATE.

BY WILLIAM STEVENS PERRY, D.D., OXON.  
BISHOP OF IOWA AND PRESIDENT OF  
GRISWOLD COLLEGE, DAVENPORT.

From the *Iowa Churchman* (Eps.), Davenport, Iowa, September and October, 1891.

THE critical examination of the New Testament writings for notices of the polity of the apostolic churches plainly indicates that the ultimate earthly authority there recog-

nized was that exercised by the Apostles, and that the means for the transmission of this authority was by the imposition of apostolic hands. In other words, the principle of individual overseership, or episcopacy, exercised by the Apostles first and by apostolic delegates afterward, and gradually taking shape in more easily recognized and definite form, is found in the New Testament scriptures, while we may search their pages in vain for any indication of the principle of Presbyterian parity or of Congregational democracy. Few and scattered as are the New Testament allusions to the polity of the Church in the days in which the Apostles were still present on the earth, the trend of each and all of these passages is evident. The source of power in the Church was not from the people or of the people. It was from above; and in these scanty notices we see apostolic rule gradually merging into episcopal authority and power.

The exercise of the commission of their Master—"As the Father hath sent me even so send I you,"—by the Twelve, chosen not by the company of believers but by the Lord Himself; the solemn investiture of Matthias, not by the people, but by the Eleven acting under divine guidance, with the office from which Judas fell; the choice of the great Apostle to the Gentiles by the great Head of the Church Himself—"an apostle not from men neither through men, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father;"\* the headship of the Church at Jerusalem as well as the title of "Apostle," so plainly accorded by St. Paul to "James, the Lord's brother," who was evidently not one of the Twelve; the absence of any hint that the apostolate was to be limited to the Twelve, and on the other hand the application of the title to Barnabas,† to Andronicus and Junias,‡ probably to Sylvanus § and to

\* Galatians 1:1.

† "The apostleship of Barnabas is beyond question. St. Luke records his consecration to the office as taking place at the same time with, and in the same manner as, St. Paul's (Acts xiii. 2, 3). In his account of their missionary labors he again names them together as 'Apostles,' even mentioning Barnabas first (Acts xiv. 4, 14). St. Paul himself also in two different epistles uses similar language. In the Galatian letter he speaks of Barnabas as associated with himself in the apostleship of the Gentiles (ii. 9); in the First to the Corinthians he claims for his fellow-laborer all the privileges of an Apostle, as one who, like himself, holds the office of an Apostle and is doing the work of an Apostle (ix. 5, 6). If, therefore, St. Paul has held a larger place than Barnabas in the gratitude and veneration of the Church of all ages, this is due not to any superiority of rank or office, but to the ascendancy of his personal gifts, a more intense energy and self-devotion, wider and deeper sympathies, a firmer intellectual grasp, a larger measure of the spirit of Christ."—Bp. Lightfoot's *Eps. to the Galatians*, pp. 96, 97.

‡ "On the most natural interpretation of a passage in the Epistle to the Romans (xvi. 7), Andronicus and Junias, two Christians otherwise unknown to us, are called distinguished members of the apostolate, language which indirectly implies a very considerable extension of the term."—*Ibid.*, p. 95.

§ In 1 Thess. ii. 6, again, where . . . he speaks of the disinterested labors of himself and his colleagues, adding

others  
"false  
Paul of  
founded  
messag  
the peo  
the "inc  
apocaly  
all part  
testimo  
the Ch  
Souls v  
polity  
the Ap  
tablish

It is  
Bishop  
good m  
show  
the sec  
ized C  
orders  
ters, a  
cannot  
same c  
on the  
brothe  
salem,  
"he w  
"the  
mothe  
days,  
while  
churcl  
traces  
"stag  
direct  
subj  
ness,  
Timot  
tolic  
funct  
centu  
foot t  
withi  
writi  
bisho  
the to  
the y  
govern  
tende  
the l  
"un  
cond  
seem

"thoug  
ties of  
Sylvan  
whose  
"Bp  
appea  
"L  
"B



others by St. Paul; the condemnation of "false apostles;" the committal by St. Paul of the charge of the churches he had founded to Timothy and Titus; the latest messages of the head of the Church, not to the people but to the rulers, the "angels," the individually-responsible heads of the apocalyptic churches; these are each and all part of that vast network of scriptural testimony uniting with its countless meshes the Church's Chief Shepherd and Bishop of Souls with the threefold ministry and the polity which, ere the death of the last of the Apostles, St. John, was universally established throughout the Church of Christ.

It is the judgment of the great Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham, whose recent death all good men deplore, that "history seems to show decisively that before the middle of the second century each Church or organized Christian community had its three orders of ministers, its bishop, its presbyters, and its deacons. On this point there cannot reasonably be two opinions."\* The same distinguished scholar, in commenting on the position occupied by St. James, the brother of the Lord, in the Church of Jerusalem, after expressing his conviction that "he was not one of the Twelve," asserts that "the episcopal office thus existed in the mother church of Jerusalem from very early days, at least in a rudimentary form;"† while the government of the Gentile churches, though presenting no distinct traces of a similar organization, exhibits "stages of development tending in this direction."‡ Lightfoot, who discusses this subject with singular moderation and fairness, concedes that the position occupied by Timothy and Titus, whom he styles "apostolic delegates," "fairly represents the functions of the bishop early in the second century."§ Even admitting with Lightfoot that "James the Lord's brother alone, within the period compassed by the apostolic writings, can claim to be regarded as a bishop in the later and more special sense of the term," and that "as late, therefore, as the year 70 no distinct signs of episcopal government have appeared in Gentile Christendom," still it must be acknowledged, in the language of the same authority, that "unless we have recourse to a sweeping condemnation of received documents, it seems vain to deny that early in the second

century the episcopal office was firmly and widely established. Thus, during the last three decades of the first century, and consequently during the lifetime of the latest surviving Apostle, this change must have been brought about."\* Again and again does this great scholar refer to the fact of the early and general establishment of episcopacy "from the Apostles' times." For example, he asserts that "the evidence for the early and wide extension of episcopacy, throughout proconsular Asia, the scene of St. John's latest labors, may be considered irrefragable."† And again, "these notices, besides establishing the general prevalence of episcopacy . . . establish this result clearly, that its maturer forms are seen first in those regions where the latest surviving Apostles, more especially St. John, fixed their abode, and at a time when its prevalence cannot be dissociated from their influence or their sanction."‡

And again, "It has been seen that the institution of an episcopate must be placed as far back as the closing years of the first century, and that it cannot, without violence to historical testimony, be dis severed from the name of St. John."§ "It will appear," continues Lightfoot, "that the pressing needs of the Church were mainly instrumental in bringing about this result, and that this development of the episcopal office was a providential safeguard amid the confusion of speculative opinion, the distracting effects of persecution, and the growing anarchy of social life, which threatened not only the extension but the very existence of the Church of Christ."|| With this cumulative presentation of the proofs of the historic episcopate from the writings of the leading scholar of the age, we may be prepared for the Bishop's summing up of the whole matter among the closing words of his *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry*: "If the preceding investigation is substantially correct, the threefold ministry can be traced to apostolic direction; and short of an express statement we can possess no better assurance of a Divine appointment, or at least a Divine sanction."¶ In even stronger language this great scholar, in his sermon before the Wolverhampton Church Congress, asserts that the Church of England has "retained a form of church government which had been handed down in unbroken continuity from the Apostles' times."

With these statements and these proofs, the language of the Ordinal of the Book of

\* though we might have been bardsome to you, being Apostles of Christ, it is probable that under this term he includes Sylvanus, who had labored with him in Thessalonica, and whose name appears in the superscription of the letter."—*Ibid.*

\* Bp. Lightfoot's *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry*, appended to his *Commentary on the Philippians*, p. 184.

† Lightfoot's *Christian Ministry*, p. 190.

‡ *Ibid.*

§ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

\* Lightfoot's *Christian Ministry*, p. 199.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 225, 226.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 232.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 265.

Common Prayer is in strict accord. "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests and deacons." The full meaning of this statement appears in the fact that it is the requirement of the canon law of the Church as well as of the Ordinal that "no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had episcopal consecration or ordination." In the judgment of Lightfoot, as evidently in the intention of the Ordinal, the "historic episcopate" includes the apostolic succession—the threefold ministry communicated by the imposition of hands and continued "in unbroken continuity from the Apostles' times."

To quote the language of Mr. Gladstone, "In the latter part of the second century of the Christian era, the subject," of the Apostolic Succession "came into distinct and formal view; and from that time forward it seems to have been considered by the great writers of the Catholic body, a fact too palpable to be doubted, and too simple to be misunderstood." \*

We have thus far dealt merely with the proofs of the historic episcopate as indicated in the New Testament and as existing during the lifetime of St. John. We turn to the witness of history to the fact that our Lord instituted in His Church, by succession from the Apostles, a threefold ministry, the highest order of these ministers alone having the authority and power to perpetuate this ministry by the laying on of hands.

The Church of Jerusalem, the mother of us all, as we have already seen, presents the earliest instance of a bishop in the sense in which the word was understood in post-apostolic times. The rule and official prominence of St. James, "the Lord's brother," is recognized both in the epistles of St. Paul and in the Acts of the Apostles. That which is so plainly indicated in the canonical Scriptures is supported by the uniform tradition of the succeeding age. On the death of St. James, which took place immediately before the war of Vespasian, Symeon succeeded to his place and rule. Hegisippus, who is our authority for this statement, and who represents Symeon as holding the same office with St. James and

with equal distinctness styles him a bishop, was doubtless born ere Symeon died. Eusebius gives us a list of Symeon's successors. In less than thirty years,—such were the troubles and uncertainties of the times,—there appear to have been thirty occupants of the see. On the building of Ælia Capitolina on the ruins of Jerusalem, Marcus presided over the Church in the Holy City as its first Gentile bishop; Narcissus, who became Bishop of Jerusalem in the year 190, is referred to by Alexander, in whose favor he resigned his see in the year 214, as still living at the age of 116—thus in this single instance bridging over the period from the time when the Apostle John was still living to the date when, by universal consent, it is conceded that episcopacy was established in all quarters of the world.

Passing from the mother Church of Jerusalem to Antioch, where the disciples were first called Christians, and which may be regarded as the natural centre of Gentile Christianity, we find from tradition that Antioch received its first bishop from St. Peter. We need not discuss the probabilities of this story, since there can be no doubt as to the name standing second on the list. Ignatius is mentioned as a bishop by the earliest authors. His own language is conclusive as to his own conviction on this point. He writes to one bishop, Polycarp. He refers by name to another, Onesimus. He contemplates the appointment of his successor at Antioch after his decease. The successor whose appointment Ignatius anticipated is said by Eusebius to have been Hero, and from his episcopate the list of Antiochene bishops is complete. If the authenticity of the entire catalogue is questionable, two bishops of Antioch at least, during the second century, Theophilus and Serapion, are confessedly historical personages. With reference to the Epistles of Ignatius, controversy has raged for centuries. Their outspoken testimony in favor of episcopacy has been regarded by the advocates of parity or of independency as a proof of their want of authenticity. But the discussion has been practically settled in our own day, and the judgment of Lightfoot, the latest and greatest commentator on these interesting remains of Christian antiquity, will be received without question by all whose opinion is worthy of consideration. He places these epistles among the earliest years of the second century, and he regards the testimony of Ignatius to the existence and universality of the threefold ministry at the period in which he lived and wrote as conclusive. The celebrated Ger-

\* *Church Principles Considered in their Results*, by W. E. Gladstone; p. 189.

man of  
charac  
learned  
the o  
bishop  
the Ig  
With  
schola  
place  
may p  
In  
second  
demne  
his m  
of his  
death  
"a m  
nates  
wrote  
is a  
repre  
Magn  
of Pe  
him l  
aged  
epistl  
to th  
remai  
Chur  
to Pe  
Troa  
borne  
from  
come  
way.  
Thou  
of hi  
discip  
bring  
thing  
write  
less  
great  
have  
was t  
the  
home  
pied  
fully  
His  
he ap  
of th  
one  
hush  
saint  
trine  
as p  
ment  
thre  
for t  
woul

man critic and scholar, Dr. Harnack, who characterizes Lightfoot's work as "the most learned and careful patristic monograph of the century," accepts the conclusions of the bishop and concedes that the genuineness of the Ignatian letters is rendered "certain." With such a witness, thus supported by scholars confessedly occupying the foremost place for learning and critical power, we may proceed to details.

In the Ignatian Letters, the writer, the second Bishop of Antioch, appears as a condemned prisoner travelling through Asia to his martyrdom at Rome. Though each step of his progress brought him nearer to death; though the severity of his guard, "a maniple of ten soldiers," whom he designates as "leopards," makes his last days wretchedly uncomfortable, still his journey is a triumph. On his arrival at Smyrna, representatives of the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia and Tralles unite with the flock of Polycarp, the Bishop of Smyrna, to do him honor. During his stay at Smyrna the aged bishop addresses four of his extant epistles to the Ephesians, to the Magnesians, to the Trallians, and to the Romans. The remaining three epistles, those to the Churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna and to Polycarp its Bishop, were written from Troas whither a deacon from Ephesus had borne him company. The saint proceeds from Neapolis to Philippi, where he is welcomed by the Church and escorted on his way, and thus he goes toward Rome. Though, in his modesty, choosing to speak of himself as "only now beginning to be a disciple," the nearness to the end evidently bringing to him new revelations of spiritual things and the life to come, he acts and writes as a man advanced in years. Doubtless he was near to man's estate when the great Apostle wrote his epistles. He must have been in full maturity when Jerusalem was trodden under foot of the Gentiles and the Church was driven from its cradle-home. He in whose life all this had transpired was now on his way to death. He fully realized that the end was near at hand. His days were numbered, and in his epistles he appears to have sought to crowd counsels of the highest moment, the dying legacy of one whose voice would soon be forever hushed in death. The points this aged saint chiefly dwells upon are two—the doctrine of the Incarnation as an historic fact, as perpetuated in sacraments, as a fundamental principle of the faith; and the threefold ministry, the divinely given rule for the Church, by which the Church itself would be recognized, and the religion of the

Christ made known as something organic, real, lasting, disciplined.

In his statements of the prerogative of the threefold ministry, Ignatius is emphatic. "It is meet, therefore, . . . that being perfectly joined together in one submission, submitting yourselves to your bishop and presbytery, ye may be sanctified in all things."\* "I was forward to exhort you, that ye run in harmony with the mind of God; for Jesus Christ also, our inseparable life, is the mind of the Father; even as the bishops that are settled in the farthest parts of the earth are in the mind of Jesus Christ. So then it becometh you to run in harmony with the mind of the bishop, which thing also ye do. For your honorable presbytery, which is worthy of God, is attuned to the bishop, even as its strings to a lyre."†

"Let no man be deceived. If any one be not within the precinct of the altar, he lacketh the bread [of God]. For, if the prayer of one and another hath so great force, how much more that of the bishop and of the whole church. . . . Let us therefore be careful not to resist the bishop, that by our submission we may give ourselves to God. And in proportion as a man seeth that his bishop is silent, let him fear him the more. For every one whom the Master of the household sendeth to be steward over his own house, we ought so to receive as Him that sent him. Plainly, therefore, we ought to regard the bishop as the Lord Himself."‡

"Assemble yourselves together . . . to the end that ye may obey the bishop and the presbytery without distraction of mind; breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote that we should not die."§

"Forasmuch, then, as I was permitted to see you in the person of your godly bishop, Damas, and your worthy presbyters, Bassus and Apollonius, and my fellow-servant the deacon, Sotion, of whom I would fain have joy, for that he is subject to the bishop as unto the grace of God, and to the presbytery as unto the law of Jesus Christ. Yea, and it becometh you also not to presume upon the youth of your bishop, but according to the power of God the Father to render unto him all reverence, . . . yet not to him but to the Father of Jesus Christ, even to the bishop of all. . . . For a man does not so much deceive this bishop, who is seen, as cheat that other who is invisible."||

\* Ad Eph., 2. In our citations we avail ourselves of Dr. Lightfoot's translation.

† Ibid., 3, 4. Lightfoot's translation.

‡ Ibid., 20.

§ Ibid., 5, 6.

|| Ad. Magn., 2, 3.

"Be ye zealous to do all things in godly concord, the bishop presiding after the likeness of God, and the presbyters after the likeness of the council of the apostles, with the deacons also who are most dear to me, having been entrusted with the diaconate of Jesus Christ." \*

"As the Lord did nothing without the Father, either by Himself or by the apostles, so neither do ye anything without the bishop and the presbyters." †

"Be obedient to the bishop, and to one another, as Jesus Christ was to the Father." ‡

"When ye are obedient to the bishop as to Jesus Christ, it is evident to me that ye are living not after men but after Jesus Christ. . . . It is therefore necessary, even as your wont is, that you should do nothing without the bishop; but be ye obedient also to the presbytery, as to the apostles. . . . And those likewise who are deacons of the mysteries of Jesus Christ must please all men in all ways. . . . In like manner let all men respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the Bishop as being a type of the Father, and the presbyters as the council of God and as the college of apostles. Apart from these there is not even the name of a Church." §

"This will surely be, if ye be not puffed up, and if ye be inseparable from [God] Jesus Christ, and from the ordinances of the apostles. He that is within the sanctuary is clean, but he that is without the sanctuary is not clean; that is, he that doeth aught without the bishop and presbytery and deacons, this man is not clean in his conscience." ||

"Fare ye well in Jesus Christ, committing yourselves to the bishop as to the commandment, and likewise also to the presbytery." ¶

"For as many as are of God and of Jesus Christ, they are with the bishop; and as many as shall repent and enter into the unity of the Church, these also shall be of God. . . . Be ye careful, therefore, to observe one Eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup unto union in His blood; there is one altar as there is one bishop, together with the presbytery and the deacons, my fellow-servants." \*\*

"Shun divisions as the beginning of evils. Do ye all follow your bishop as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and the presbytery as

the apostles; and to the deacons pay respect, as to God's commandment. Let no man do aught of things pertaining to the Church apart from the Bishop. Let that be held a valid Eucharist which is under the bishop, or one to whom he shall have committed it. Whosoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be; even as where Jesus may be, there is the universal Church. It is not lawful apart from the bishop either to baptize or to hold a love-feast, but whatever he shall approve; this is well-pleasing also to God, that everything which ye do may be sure and valid." \*

"It is good to recognize God and the bishop. He that honoreth the bishop is honored of God. He that doeth aught without the knowledge of the bishop rendereth service to the devil." †

There can be no question that the writer of these extracts held clear and well-defined views both as to the existence of a visible, organized Church of Christ, and a threefold, divinely authorized ministry ruling that Church. This he deems to be the "mind of God;" this is "the commandment;" and so fully does he hold this view that in his dying counsels he emphasized the idea that he who would keep the "commandment" and run in accord with the divine mind must lose sight of his very individuality in the fellowship of the Church, and unhesitatingly and without reserve submit himself in action, word, or purpose to the divinely appointed rule and order of the Church. Nor is this all. He regards the threefold ministry as essential to the very being of the Church; for, to quote his own words, as rendered by Lightfoot, "without these three orders no Church has a title to the name." ‡ This hierarchy, this monarchical episcopate, the aged bishop of Antioch regards as "firmly rooted," as "beyond dispute," and as coextensive with the Church. He speaks of bishops as established in "the farthest parts of the earth," § and it is evident from his language that, in his judgment, the episcopate is not an evolution from the presbyterate, but is from above, the ordering of God Himself.

To these words of Ignatius, so clear, so strong, so abundant, we turn to the testimony of Irenaeus, who was born not later than A.D. 130. He asserts that in his youth he sat at the feet of Polycarp, who had been appointed by the apostles a bishop for Asia in the Church of Smyrna, and that he had listened to the discourses in

\* Ad. Magn., 6.

§ Ad. Trall., 2, 3.

\*\* Ad. Philad., 3, 4.

† Ibid., 7.

‡ Ibid., 7.

‡ Ibid., 13.

¶ Ibid., 13.

\* Ad. Smyrn., 8. † Ibid., 9. ‡ Ad. Trall., 3. § Ad. Eph., 3.



public and private of this venerable man, whose very looks and ways, he assures us, were indelibly impressed upon his mind. Irenæus further claims that he had opportunities of instruction from Asiatic "elders," some of whom, he tells us, had been disciples of the apostles. With these means of learning the traditions of the Church in Asia Minor, as shaped by no less an authority than St. John himself, the latest living of the apostolic band, Irenæus, while yet a young man and probably prior to Polycarp's martyrdom (*circa* A.D. 155), removed from Asia to Rome. At the latest, in the year 177, when persecution visited the churches of southern Gaul, Irenæus was a presbyter of Lyons, and was elevated to the see of the martyred bishop Pothinus. There is record of his visiting Rome prior to his entrance upon the episcopal office as well as afterward; his object in each case being to promote the peace of the Church. Thus fitted by circumstances as well as by his character to know and maintain the "traditions of the elders," we find in his writings, to quote the language of the latest authority on this subject, Mr. Charles Gore, in his work on "The Ministry of the Christian Church," "the picture of the universal Church, spread all over the world, handing down in unbroken succession the apostolic truth; and the bond of unity, the link to connect the generations in the Church, is the episcopal succession."\*

The language of Irenæus is clear and determinate with reference to the succession of the bishops to the authority and rule exercised by the apostles in the Church, and "because it would be tedious . . . to enumerate the succession of all the Churches," he gives that of the Church of Rome, and records the committal of the episcopate by the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul to Linus (A.D. 68), and then the succession from him of Anencletus (A.D. 80), Clement (A.D. 92), Evarestus (A.D. 100), Alexander (A.D. 109), Xystus (A.D. 119), Telesphorus the Martyr (A.D. 128), Hyginus (A.D. 139), Pius (A.D. 142), Anicetus (A.D. 157), Soter (A.D. 168), and at length in his own day, of Eleutherus (A.D. 177).† Certain discrepancies which confessedly exist in the various lists of Roman bishops which have come down to us may be explained by assuming the existence in the very first ages of two distinct Churches, one Jewish and one Gentile, at Rome. Lightfoot, while claiming that "no more can safely be assumed of

Linus and Anencletus than that they held some prominent position in the Romish Church,"\* adds that "the reason for supposing Clement to have been a bishop is as strong as the universal tradition of the next ages can make it." It in no way detracts from this admission with respect to Clement that Lightfoot regards him rather as "the chief of the presbyters than the chief over presbyters," and consequently not in the position of irresponsible authority occupied by his successors Eleutherus (A.D. 177) and Victor (A.D. 189), or even by his contemporaries Ignatius of Antioch, and Polycarp of Smyrna.

With Victor, apparently the first Latin prelate who held the bishopric of Rome, a new era begins. The line of ecclesiastical descent is now clearly defined, and by the participation in each consecration of three or more of the episcopal order required by the early canons and continued with scrupulous exactness till the modern view of episcopacy as held by the papacy permitted at times the substitution of the papal authority for the presence of more than a single consecrator, there has been knitted together the meshes of that vast network which in its comprehensiveness includes the Church's chief rulers from the very first, and by the multitude of interlacing lines of succession makes any serious defect in the direct connection with the apostles of any individual bishop well-nigh impossible. The succession of bishops from the apostles' times is not to be regarded as a chain of single links, the whole being of no greater strength than its weakest part, but as a network or web of interwoven strands, now innumerable, which would hold together even if, to venture an impossible supposition, nine-tenths of these lines could be proved defective and therefore invalid. In other words, a possible defect in one, or in a hundred, of the different lines of succession would in no way affect the consecration of any bishop of our day, so infinite in number are the interlacing strands of the great network uniting one who has been set apart for this office and administration in the Church of God with the apostles, and through the apostles with Christ, the Great Shepherd and Bishop of Souls.

**AUTHORITIES.**—In addition to the late Bishop of Durham's dissertation on "The Christian Ministry," appended to his Commentary on the Philippians, and the many special treatises on the Apostolical Succession by Perceval, Haddon, Eltrington, Morse,

\* Gore's *Ministry of the Christian Church*, chap. iii., p. 119.  
† Iren., iii. 3. The dates we have given to the successive incumbents of the See of Rome are from Lightfoot.

\* Com. on the Philippians. *The Christian Ministry*, p. 219.

and others, the latest and most conclusive work on the general subject is that of Gore, "The Ministry of the Christian Church," Rivington's, London, 1889. A compact treatise by the Rev. Professor J. H. Barbour, of the Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., is admirably arranged and deserves general reading. Its title is "The Beginnings of the Historic Episcopate Exhibited in the Words of Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors." New York: E & J. B. Young & Co., 1887. Canon Liddon, in his sermon entitled "A Father in Christ" (Rivington's, 1875), effectually disposes of the arguments of the late Dr. Hatch, in his Bampton Lectures on the "Organization of Early Christian Churches," as well as those of a later paper in the *Contemporary Review* from the same source. A scholarly and conclusive volume has just appeared, written in Latin, of upward of six hundred pages octavo, which gives in detail, and with sufficient critical apparatus, both the arguments for the apostolical succession and lists of bishops from the apostles' times to our own day. The title of this work is as follows: "De Successione Apostolica necnon Missione et Jurisdictione Hierarchiæ Anglicanæ et Catholicæ, unacum appendicibus et indicibus: Auctore Venerabili Doctore Jacobo Clark, Archidiacono Antiquensi, Sacellano Exam. Dno. Antiquensi Epo Rectore Par. S. Philippi in Antigua. Georgiopolis in Guiana Britannica: MDCCCXC." The third edition of a clever compendium of the argument, by the Rev. Andrew Gray, a Priest of the Diocese of Massachusetts, has just been published in Boston. It is entitled "Apostolical Succession in the English, Scottish, and American Church, from S. John the Apostle to the present time, in the line of consecrators, taken from authentic records." A learned work by the present Bishop of Oxford, the eminent historian Dr. William Stubbs, gives the succession in the Church of England. The title of this work is "Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum. An attempt to exhibit the course of Episcopal Succession in England, from the records and chronicles of the Church." Oxford: University Press, 1858.

### LIFE IN THE EGYPTIAN FAMILY.

BY PROFESSOR DR. HERMANN V. HILPRECHT.

From *The Sunday-School Times* (Udenom.), Philadelphia, October 3 and 10, 1891.

ALTHOUGH centuries have rolled between us and the mighty empires of the ancient

world, and a retrospect must bring out everywhere the profound differences between present and past, that old-world life had two features in common with our own,—the family and the state. In the family, the principles of love, piety, and morality prevailed; in the state, the spirit of the law, the spirit of right and might, was sovereign. On both these sides we must examine the life of every established nation of antiquity, if we would have a picture of its social conditions in a faithful historical setting.

Family and state are complementary. The family precedes the state, and gives life to it. And though the state is not simply an evolution of the family, a view supported even by such political writers as Wagner and Dahlmann, still, the course which civilization has taken since the most ancient times has tended to bring the family man and the citizen under a single point of view; and when once we have entered the sphere of order and settled condition, of liberty and personality, it is impossible to keep them apart. The state is the sheltering roof beneath which the family is developed and waxes strong. And the family, on the other hand, becomes the mainstay of the state, and contributes vital strength to the great organism of the commonwealth. "The people (made up of families) forms the state. And the state is the consummation of the people." This sentence of Trendlenburg, of course, expresses the modern view of the relation between state and family, which we know is at variance with the one-sided Aristotelean maxim, "Man is a ζῷον πολιτικόν" ("a political animal"). But although in the ancient world the individual never attained the proper amount of self-assertion in the state, yet family life was a necessary and important factor in the life of the people, and naturally became the pulse of the state, indicating a healthy or a morbid condition. Thus it was with the Greeks and Romans, with the Germanic nations, with the Babylonians and Assyrians on the Tigris and Euphrates; and the same conditions prevailed on the banks of the lower Nile.

The basis of Egyptian life was agriculture. As to-day the fellahs, so in ancient times the peasants and shepherds were the main stock of the population. As a natural result, the Egyptians, as a whole, were always a peace-loving people, that only took up arms when it was necessary to ward off attacks from without, or when it became desirable to gain possession of the products of neighboring countries. The principal

centers  
numero  
Original  
sanctua  
to inc  
increas  
became  
intellec  
Our pr  
therefo  
the inh  
more f  
ments  
found  
popula  
tion to  
This  
princes  
with  
depend  
of up  
their  
and th  
their l

Wh  
ancien  
those  
which  
der an  
valley  
ever  
in E  
monu  
pyram  
light  
of sto  
of so  
by th  
more  
temp  
in ev  
of th  
city  
a tru  
hous  
the  
whic  
of th  
the c  
the t  
lows  
separ  
The  
or vo  
of t

\* F  
I am  
"Aeg  
1885  
thun  
result  
Eber

centers of industry and commerce were the numerous cities on both banks of the Nile. Originally clustering about the temples and sanctuaries, they grew, in course of time, to independent communities, and as they increased in size or importance gradually became the representative centers of the intellectual and political life of Egypt. Our present sketch of Egyptian conditions, therefore, will be principally concerned with the inhabitants of these cities, and this the more for the reason that most of the monuments and papyrus relics that have been found throw light only on that part of the population which stood in immediate relation to the royal court and the priests. This class consisted principally of the princes and state officials of every grade, with their families, and their numerous dependants and slaves, in the great cities of upper and lower Egypt. The scene of their activity was the family in private life and the state in public. Let us see how their life at home was passed.\*

When we recall the architecture of the ancient Pharaohs, we naturally think of those mighty ruins of tombs and temples which in our century have become the wonder and the center of attraction in the Nile valley. These gigantic structures, however, are rather the exception than the rule in Egyptian architecture. Massive and monumental as were their temples and pyramids, their style of house-building was light and perishable. Their walls, instead of stone, were made of Nile mud. Instead of solid pillars, their roofs were supported by the slender trunks of palms and sycamores. "One feature was common to both temple and house,—the rich glow of color in every part of the structure." In view of the scarcity and fragmentary character of city ruins, it is extremely difficult to obtain a true picture of the Egyptian dwelling-house. Leaving out of consideration for the present the simpler country-house, which was only used during certain seasons of the year, an ordinary dwelling-house of the eighteenth or nineteenth dynasty (about the time of Moses) was constructed as follows: A court surrounded by a high wall separated the building from the street. The entrance was marked by an ante-room or vestibule for the watchman. In the rear of this was the large dining-hall, which

formed the center of the house. Back of this there was a small open yard, flanked on the right by the bedrooms of the owners. On the left were the kitchen and storerooms, besides the rooms for the servants. At the farther end was the house of the women and the well-kept garden; for the wealthy Egyptian took great pleasure in his garden or park, and speaks with pride of his fragrant flowers and refreshing fountains.

The love of flowers and shrubbery was a characteristic of the nation. I cannot do better than illustrate this regard for flowers in the words of the prominent Egyptologist of Berlin: "Wherever one looks upon the monuments, there are flowers. Bunches of flowers are offered up to the gods. Garlands of flowers cover the coffins of the dead. Flowers decorate the houses, and floral designs form the capital of the temple pillars. No less is the Egyptian attached to shady trees. He prays that the Nile may give to his soul all flowering plants in due time, and hopes that his soul may perch on the branches of the trees which he has planted, and may find cool repose in the shade of his sycamores. And as the scenery of his native country, with his plowed fields and matchless palm-groves and parched soil, cannot offer him these advantages, he supplies the want by landscape gardening. All the associations that nature, with its wood and meadow, has for us, the Egyptian found in his well-kept garden. It is the place of love, and its trees are the confidants of lovers" (Erman, p. 272). This pronounced liking of the ancient Egyptians is not without significance. A people which took such a delight in gardens and flowers, that decked its tables with lotos and papyrus blossoms, which ornamented house and home with fragrant garlands, must have sought and found in its home life something beyond what the heathendom of antiquity usually offered, and what the Mohammedan Orient of to-day offers to its inhabitants.

Attempts have been made to show that the difference in the position of woman constitutes the essential difference between Orient and Occident. And at the first glance this does seem to be true; for while, in the Occident, woman is the equal of man, and is regarded with a reverence which at times almost assumes the form of woman-worship, in the Egypt and Arabia of to-day we meet with scenes of an entirely different description. The ignorance of Oriental women is proverbial, and the contempt of the female sex is characteristic of life in the East. If a Bedouin speaks of his shoe or

\* For several important statements contained in this sketch I am especially indebted to Professor Erman's excellent work, "Aegypten und Aegyptisches Leben im Alterthum" (Tübingen, 1883); to Professor Ewald Meyer's "Geschichte des Alterthums," Vol. I (Stuttgart, 1884), to which I contributed the results of my own Babylonian researches; and to Brugsch's, Ebers's, Mariette's, and Maspero's well-known publications.

ass, his pig or his wife, he often makes the interjection, "*Ajellak Allah!*" ("May God elevate thee.") One of the most current proverbs in the mouth of the Syrian is, "A man can stand anything but mentioning his wives." The question has been discussed among them, in all sincerity, whether woman really belongs to the genus *homo*. But this state of affairs did not always exist. While, to day, devastation and degradation have followed in the train of the crescent, the ancient Egyptians had reached a degree of social development in which they were only rivalled by the richly endowed inhabitants of Sumer and Akkad, on the Persian Gulf.

And so it is that in the ancient kingdoms of the Pharaohs matrimony and family life, as the sphere in which woman exercised her dignity, assumed an exceptionally pure and exalted form. When we remember this, we understand more fully why it was that God brought the children of Israel to the banks of the Nile, there to develop into an independent nation. It was through their intercourse with these highly cultivated Egyptians, a people of high moral standards and stern views of life, that the children of Israel were to be schooled and made fit to be true beacon-lights among the nations of the world, and executors of God's eternal plan of salvation.

It was a cordial and intimate relation that existed between man and wife in ancient Egypt. In a number of tombs, and on many a papyrus found in connection with the dead, we see man and wife represented as seated beside each other. In hundreds of these decorations they are represented with their arms fondly wound about each other's necks. The higher the social position of the deceased, the more beautiful and touching are the words referring to their mutual regard and affection. The wife, for instance, is called *ben-t merut eft ha-s* ("palm of love to her husband"); or, besides a hundred other epithets, she is called "devoted to her husband,"—a frequently recurring title of honor given to Egyptian women. Therefore it is very natural that the ancient book of wisdom of the Governor Ptah hôtep, who lived about 3000 B.C., under King Assa, should declare him wise who—to use his own words—"founds for himself a house and loves his wife."

Even these few glimpses into the oldest Egyptian period show that the position of woman was hardly below that which she occupies in the civilized countries of the present day. Add to this the significant

fact that most of the pictures of festivities and social gatherings which have been preserved show us both sexes in unrestricted social intercourse, sitting beside each other in long rows of gay colors, and engaged in conversation; also that the female mummies, as a rule, were embalmed much more carefully and adorned more sumptuously than those of men, and that the monuments of nearly every period (even the decree of Canopus under Ptolemaeus Euergetes I., 239 B.C.) expressly give to queens and princesses divine honor in common with her Pharaohs. In view of these facts, there can be no doubt of the high respect paid to the Egyptian woman, and of the high esteem with which she was regarded, under the older as well as the later Egyptian dynasties.

In a state where woman was so highly honored, it is but natural to infer that monogamy was prevalent. Such was indeed the case, as has been abundantly proved by the hieroglyphs and the best authorities on hieroglyphic literature. And though there have been individual attempts (as by Erman) to place Egyptian morals on this point on the same low level with those of classic antiquity, yet we must most emphatically assert, with Brugsch, Ebers, Eduard Meyer, and other Egyptologists, that Egyptian family life, especially in the oldest towns, was exceptionally pure and refined. It is true, the custom of intermarriage between sisters and brothers prevalent throughout the ancient heathen world, and mentioned in Egyptian literature, as well as in the Old Testament, became, in the days of the Ptolemy and the Romans, the rule in Egypt; and it is likewise true that such marriages are revolting to our natural moral sense. But in passing judgment upon this custom, we should not forget that, according to the views of those nations, such a marriage seemed the most natural thing; and, according to the belief of the old Egyptians, even the great gods themselves, Osiris and Set, had their sisters, Isis and Nephthys, to wife. Cases of actual bigamy, on the other hand, seem to have been extremely rare among the mass of the people, and restricted to the rulers and nobles at court, who possessed the necessary means to defray the extra expense incurred by the enlarged household.

Political intrigues were often the reason for polygamous marriages in the case of monarchs, as is conclusively shown by the example of King Rameses II. Private individuals were sometimes led into double marriages by acquiring the possessions of a

rich Egyptian, however, radically are most objects, a tants of privilege the soul to the well-guar read on she follow noferu, bride."teenth of the Man and mon ho in keep duties. snares, for the among when h welcom

No p sents a relation a wise praised thing tian's happy of pare found it. T Day" ing"). we find that i Father bodies name is Cor efa ("kingd comm ness, while ful," (Nef (Nef as we toma but taste lower name popo (My earli



rich Egyptian heiress. It is worth noting, however, that we find the harem only sporadically mentioned on the tombs, which are most communicative on all other subjects, and that at no time were the inhabitants of the harem accorded the rights and privileges of wifehood. One woman was the soul of the house, and was legally bound to the man by a carefully drawn up and well-guarded matrimonial contract. We read on the sarcophagus of Onnophris that she followed her husband as *meret aperetel-nuferu*; that is, "as a lovable, beautiful bride." And a high official of the eighteenth dynasty describes his wedding as one of the most important events of his life. Man and wife lived together in their common home. The wife helped her husband in keeping house and in his professional duties. She watched him as he set his bird-snare, or accompanied him as he set out for the hunt, in his skiff, in the swamp among the bulrushes, or in the evening, when he returned to his pleasant home, she welcomed him with open arms.

No part of the Egyptian family life presents a more attractive picture than the relation between parents and children. If a wise patriarch on the banks of the Nile praised even his own house as "the best thing on earth," assuredly the old Egyptian's highest joy was the possession of a happy home and happy children. The joy of parents in the birth of a child frequently found striking expression in the name given it. Thus we find a *Hau-nefer* ("Beautiful Day"), or a *Duat-nefret* ("Beautiful Morning"). Away back in the earliest period we find girls called *Nefret-en-ets* or *Nebt'et*; that is, "Her Father's Beauty" or "Her Father's Mistress." Another Egyptian embodies all his paternal joy and hope in the name of his daughter, *Ey-nefer* ("Beauty is Coming"), or in that of his son, *Ey-d'efa* ("Wealth is Coming"). In the middle kingdom we find such designations quite common as names of women, as "Sweetness," "Blossom," "Beautiful Sycamore;" while the ripening boy was called "Healthy," "Strong," "Beautiful of Thought" (*Nefer-sechru*), and "Beautiful of Deed" (*Nefer-ert-nef*). Among Semitic nations, as well as among the Egyptians, it was customary to give animal names to children; but still it seems a singular perversion of taste, and one by no means confined to the lower classes, to give to innocent girls such names as "Tadpole," "Monkey," "Hippopotamus Daughter," or "Little Cat" (*Myt-sher'eu*). The inscriptions of the earliest period show that it was quite cus-

tomary to name the children after the deity specially honored in the family, and so we meet with a *Seker-ch'a-bau* ("Spirit-Beaming is God"), *Seker* or *Nefer-her-en-Ptah* ("Beautiful is the Countenance of Ptah"), or *Neter-user* ("God is Rich"), *Ra'nofer*, *Ra'holep* ("Rah is Beautiful," "Rah is Well Pleased"). In Egypt the custom of calling children after the ruling prince was even more prevalent than elsewhere, and not infrequently this gives us an important chronological clew. Still we can hardly repress a smile when we read that S'abu, the patriotic old high-priest of Memphis, was so constant in his loyalty that he called four of his promising sprouts *Ptah-shepses*.

These short hints about Egyptian family names give us a glimpse into their family life. Let us attempt to make the picture more complete by looking into the home itself. As soon as a child was born in Egypt, the mother made an offering of praise and thanksgiving to the deity of the city. The first four years of his life our "wise youngster," as he is called in the inscription of the high-priest Beken-chón (now in Munich), passes under the personal care and supervision of his mother. For three years she nourishes him and carries him about on her back,—a custom that can be observed to this day among the country people along the Nile. During this period, on account of the warm climate, the mother does not spend much time in making clothes for her baby, and the inscriptions tell of a young prince, the grandson of Chufu, or Cheops (builder of the great pyramid, about 3000 B.C.), who became so attached to nature's garb that he did not want to give it up even when he went to school. Of course, these early childhood days were spent in Egypt as they are elsewhere. The boys played with their clowns (a fine specimen of one of them is to be found in the Leyden Museum), or with their toy cats or crocodiles, made of wood (some of which are still preserved in the Berlin Museum).

The little girls in the times of the Pharaohs, as now, bestowed their tenderness and affection upon beautiful dolls which could move their arms and legs. But the time for play was soon over. When the boy reached his fourth year, he was sent to school, or, as the Egyptians express it, he became a writer in the book-house. A plain girdle was in the olden time the only dress of these little scholars. The boy now naturally passed from under the wing of his mother to the jurisdiction of his father. If the father happened to be wealthy, or occupied an influential position in the state,

he had his boy educated in company with the young princes at the court of the Pharaoh. At all events, the early instruction of the Egyptian boy had in view his pursuits as a youth and his final calling as a man.

The praiseworthy basis of this Egyptian school life was strict obedience to the father's will, and reverence and respect for elders. The child was drilled in the practical rules of life and morality, which were laid down as guides for action. Thus we read, for example, in a papyrus of the Louvre collection: "Do not follow the advice of a fool," "Build not thy tomb higher than that of thy superior," "Do not maltreat an inferior," "Respect those who are worthy of respect," "Curse not thy master before God," "Contradict not thy master," "Save not thy life at the cost of another," "Repeat not slander," "Be faithful in carrying a message." A so called Egyptian law of etiquette, from a papyrus of the later kingdom of the time of Moses (now in the Great Bulâq Museum) might even now find a place in our street-cars. It reads, "Never forget to be respectful, and do not sit down while one who is older, or holds a superior office, is standing."

Scientific instruction in Egyptian schools was confined principally to exercise in reading and writing the hieroglyphic and hieratic characters. It also included the fundamentals of mathematics and astronomy,—the latter occupying a prominent part in the curriculum, in connection with the studies of the Egyptian deities of light. Gymnastic exercises and swimming lessons also formed a part of the regular course of instruction. Besides this, the children of priests received special training in Egyptian theology, a rather mixed-up affair. The principal aim of this study was to bring some sort of unity and order into the manifold and contradictory religious traditions, to define the sphere of the different national and local deities, and, in short, to establish a theological system, that in its historical development finally resolved itself into a general solar monotheism.

When an extensive household was kept up, there was need of a large number of servants. At the head of these stood the provision-keeper or steward. Such a majordomo was not generally hard pressed in the struggle for existence, as is well illustrated in a burial-scene of the twelfth dynasty, where the honorable gentleman has increased his circumference to such an extent that he is unable to carry the customary offering on the occasion of his master's funeral.

Under this so-called "chief" a host of menials were employed, who betitled themselves according to their special duties. Here we meet one who calls himself residence inspector, another is the "overseer of the bake-house;" a third, "secretary of the bar;" another, "manufacturer of sweets;" another, "carrier of cool drinks." And if we continue our rounds through the house we shall meet the "door-tender," the bakers, the butchers, the gardeners, and men of all work, each of whom does his part in keeping up the establishment. It is difficult to determine to what extent these were serfs or freemen. Slavery was, of course, prevalent, and the slave trade flourished. Even leaving out of consideration the great antiquity of this trade, as carried on especially by the Phœnicians, we find sufficient evidence of its existence in Egypt in the numerous representations, on the monuments, of male and female servants of light and dark skin who plainly were not native Egyptians. From the earliest times down to the Alexandrian period frequent mention is made of the labors and casual escape of slaves. The wars with the neighboring negro tribes who dwelt in the narrow and infertile Nile valley, up as far as the third and fourth cataracts, living mainly by agriculture and their flocks, furnished the numerous black slaves, whilst Syrian maidens and Hebrew youths, with their lighter skin, were imported into the Delta by Semitic caravans for a good price. It is probable that, as a rule, these slaves were treated kindly by their Egyptian masters, especially those who had charge of kitchen and cellar; for the Egyptian needed a good meal to complete his happiness.

In the earlier period it was customary for persons to sit two by two at a little table about half a foot high, each tearing off pieces of meat from the roast, without much formality. In the later kingdom, however, people were seated on high bolstered chairs with lions' feet, and were waited on by slaves. We know very little of the culinary art of the Egyptians. The favorite diet was roast goose. The bird was plucked, a skewer put through its neck, and then it was placed in hot ashes in a clay oven. The staff of life, then as now, was bread, and the Harris Papyrus mentions about thirty different kinds, which were baked in pans or pasted on the cone-shaped oven till they were done. Since life after death was regarded as essentially a continuation of the former existence, the prayers for the deceased included a petition for bread, beer, goose, and beef, that the beloved thoroughly

enjoy his the cata discovered than ten ent kinds and cake beer, and assortment old Egypt tion, and their we

I have brewed a so-called dark color subjects ceased c without tendency find the sional ca song (pu a little 'Eney to beer, el thy bou ing han as those demand ished w of bread strong, sorrow,

"Th books a "Th evening "Th and bri "Th no long "Th as a ho "Th breaki "Th them "O curse "O the Sh "O upon "F As certai alway had n sibly Rome phis

enjoy his post-mortem happiness. One of the catalogues of sacrifices that have been discovered demands for the deceased no less than ten different kinds of meat, five different kinds of fowl, sixteen kinds of bread and cake, six kinds of wine, four kinds of beer, and eleven kinds of fruit, besides an assortment of sweets. We see that those old Egyptians must have had a good digestion, and modesty was certainly not one of their weaknesses.

I have twice mentioned beer. This was brewed from ground barley, or from the so-called Upper Egypt wheat, in light and dark color, and was the usual drink of the subjects of the Pharaohs. Even the deceased cannot get along in immortal bliss without his jug of beer. Recognizing this tendency to drink, we are not surprised to find the Egyptians indulging in an occasional carousal, or, as it is called in a love-song (published by Maspero), "instituting a little beer-house." Well did the wise 'Eney teach: "Restrain thyself in drinking beer, else thou wilt fall down and break thy bones, and no one will lend thee a helping hand." But his sayings availed as little as those of the equally wise Danuf, who demanded of his son that he should be satisfied with two jugs of beer and three loaves of bread. The Egyptian youths were headstrong, and went their own way. Full of sorrow, a teacher writes to his pupil:

"They tell me that thou art leaving thy books and giving thyself up to pleasure.

"Thou goest from street to street. Each evening thy beery breath.

"Thy breath of beer, keeps men aloof, and brings thy soul to destruction.

"Thou art as a broken oar, that obeys no longer its oarsman.

"Thou art as a temple without a God, as a house without bread.

"They find thee climbing the wall and breaking the board.

"The people fly before thee, thou striketh them in thy folly.

"O that thou mightest see that wine is a curse!

"O that thou mightest quickly renounce the Shede-cup!

"O that thou mightest not set thy heart upon drinks that are cooling.

"But mightest forget the T'enreku!"

As long as these excesses were confined to certain classes, especially to students, who always are inclined to lively pranks, they had no deeper significance, and might possibly be excused; for not only in ancient Rome and Athens, but in Thebes and Memphis as well, the poets encouraged mirth

and hilarity. But when, in the Egypt of the later kingdom, we find depicted on the walls of a tomb a scene from the life of the deceased, evidently a woman of rank, representing her in a state of intoxication; or when, in the notorious trial for high treason of the women of King Ramses III.'s harem, the court of inquiry instituted by Pharaoh is making common cause with the female conspirators in a so-called "beer-house" or symposium,—we must admit that there are here unmistakable signs of a general demoralization presaging the downfall of the state.

#### LIFE IN THE EGYPTIAN STATE.

##### SECOND PAPER.

In a previous article I have discussed the Egyptian family in its relation to the state, showing that it was the result of historical development in Egypt as elsewhere. I now propose to discuss the Egyptian state briefly, in its principal outlines.\*

The Egyptian state, as a study of the monuments pictures it to us, is a well-ordered bureaucracy, with the king as its head in touch with the divine. The whole system was pervaded by a religion that exerted its influence in every sphere of thought and activity.

The fact that the peasantry were not freeholders is an important feature in the Egyptian state. A few privileged nobles, the district chiefs (*nomarchs*) and the territorial aristocracy (*rpá*), owned most of the national area, having under their control large territories of forest and field land as family possessions. In different periods the details of the state system varied somewhat. In the oldest period the state government was a decentralized one. The country was divided into forty districts, and each of them subdivided into a number of smaller sections, each with its own judiciary, corn magazines, and military. The central power in this organism was the *Chunu*, or the Department of the Interior, the treasury, with its hundreds and thousands of officials. And just as the treasury department had its chief secretary, one of the principal officials in the state, who, with a host of assistants, superintendents, comptrollers, and clerks of the silver vaults, exercised a close supervision over all the nation's finances, and collected "what the

\* Chapters five, six, and seven, in Erman's "Aegypten und Aegyptisches Leben im Alterthum" (Tübingen, 1883), prove especially instructive for a right understanding of the historical development of the Egyptian state.

heavens send, what the earth brings forth, and what the Nile deposits," so also the granaries, agriculture, forestry, and justice, and whatever else was under state control, had its own administration. While thus in the older kingdom the hierarchy of government officials, under the supreme head of the powerful monarch, was developed with great minuteness, we find the characteristic of the middle kingdom to be the weakness of the royal house, which makes itself felt throughout the civic system. The nomarchs, who were formerly considered officially responsible to the Pharaohs as his stewards, now become independent. On the other hand, the supervisor of the treasury and finance department succeeded in gradually concentrating an immense power in his own person in a manner detrimental to the public welfare, and in delegating the manifold duties thus devolved upon him to a host of sub-officials, who looked to him for support and continuance in office.

The later state, under which Israel grew up as a nation, presents a different picture. The hereditary nobility, who were always insubordinate and inclined to revolt against the Pharaoh, were abolished by King Ta'a and 'Ahmose. The territories left ownerless were either confiscated by force, or compensation was made by conferring honors and titles upon the former owners. This was the origin of the abnormal condition of later Egypt, where all real estate, with the exception of the privileged acres of the priests, was owned by the Pharaoh, who leased it out to his subjects, both freemen and serfs, for a heavy rent.

The foregoing description might leave the impression that Egypt had no other inhabitants but those that constantly meet us on the pictures and inscriptions of the tombs; namely, the nobles, with their vast domains and high offices; the numberless priests of the gods; the thousands of office-holders belonging to both castes, and the hosts of serfs, slaves, and peasants. But then it might well be asked, How was it possible that in a state so curiously circumstanced, with such an excessive power in the hands of the nobles on the one hand, and such a degradation of the commoners on the other, there was such a true family life, such a strong affection for house and home, and in general such a high culture and civilization? But neither the Egypt of the oldest nor that of the latest period was such a slave state; and, though traces of a free middle class in the earliest period are extremely rare, the reason for this is to be found in the fact that the custom of build-

ing tombs was novel and not generally prevalent in the early kingdom, and was a luxury practically confined to the highest and wealthiest classes. But in the ruins excavated in the Fayûm by Petrie, and in the tombs of Abydos, in the middle kingdom, we find reference to any number of people that lived, died, and were buried without rank or distinction. There is no cogent reason for not considering these the true middle class in the kingdom of the Pharaohs,—a middle class consisting of well-to-do merchants and mechanics, free citizens as landholders on a small scale, etc., who stood on the same social plane with the royal officials of the state.

To enter upon a discussion of these extremely difficult social relations would be beyond the scope of the present paper. It therefore remains only to sketch briefly the relation of the free citizen to the state, and to show, on the basis of original sources, what were the rights and duties of the Egyptian subject. "We meet everywhere a humane spirit, a lively sense of what is right and just." The laws according to which the court, as well as the Pharaoh himself, made his decision, are preserved in part in the writings of Diodorus Siculus, and in part are known from the monuments themselves. According to these, Egyptian law was brief and strict, but it had in view the welfare of the land and its people. It claimed the honor of having been originally composed and written down, in its essential principles, by the ibis-headed god of wisdom, Thot, the great governor of the sungod Re.

The murder of a freeman or slave was punished by death. Perjury also was a capital offence, and in the severity of this punishment we see the importance they justly attached to the oath. The adulterer lost his nose, the traitor his tongue, the forger his hand. Infanticide was punished by compelling the mother to hold the dead infant in her arms for three days, and then giving her up to the executioner. Thieves were scourged, and the Lee Papyrus (I.) tells of a conjurer who was said to have been scourged to death. When a prisoner began denying the charge, he was subjected to *bastinado*, or, as the Egyptians emphatically expressed it, "He was investigated with a thorough investigation."

The tribunal of justice under the old dynasty was the so-called "Grand House" (*Peraâ*, from which our word "Pharaoh" is derived). This was a fixed corporation of high government officers. The great "Court of Justice" of the middle and later

empires,  
priests un  
each case  
the temp  
of Phara  
pose, as  
Only the  
writer o  
who kee  
appointe  
times.  
officers c  
parties c  
In a su  
argues l  
clares th  
the def  
court p  
fined su  
three ti  
do it!  
a crim  
in thre  
1. T  
ernor,  
prefer  
2. T  
and is  
3. T  
by the  
determ  
flicted  
in exc  
officer  
more  
and t  
pursu  
have  
the pe  
ber of  
the tr  
tese"  
thous  
fuller  
consp  
ated  
Egyp  
king  
M  
teres  
Egyp  
ence  
ple p  
prot  
colle  
alwa  
to c  
and  
giga  
his  
obta



empires, however, was a changing body of priests and laymen, differently composed for each case, and sitting either at the gate of the temple or in the famous "Court-room of Pharaoh," specially built for this purpose, as was the case in Southern Thebes. Only the clerk of the court, "the royal writer of truth" as he likes to be called, who keeps the minutes, is a permanently appointed officer, also during the later times. The proceedings are all oral. The officers of the court are sitting, whilst the parties engaged in the trial are standing. In a suit of civil law the claimant first argues his case. The presiding officer declares that it has been heard and calls upon the defendant to answer. After this the court passes sentence, and the one who is fined submits to the decision, exclaiming three times, "I'll do it! Yes, I will surely do it! I will do it!" The procedure in a criminal case differs from this proceeding in three points:

1. The prosecutor in this case is the governor, as the person to whom the charges preferred are to be addressed.

2. The court simply investigates the case, and is satisfied to convict the defendant.

3. The record of the case, as drawn up by the clerk, is submitted to the king. He determines the penalty which is to be inflicted; provided that he should not prefer, in exceptional cases, to pass by the highest officers of the court, and to entrust one or more of his favorites with the investigation and the sentence. This latter method is pursued in cases where the king disliked to have public proceedings conducted before the people. The monuments tell of a number of such criminal cases; as, for instance, the trial of the "great royal spouse 'Emtose" under Pharaoh Pepy, about three thousand years before Christ, or, with even fuller details, the case of the great harem conspiracy under Ramses III., which created a great deal of excitement throughout Egypt, and came very near costing the king his throne and his life.

More might be said, and not without interest, of the methods of procedure in the Egyptian court, but I make only a reference to the obligations under which the people placed themselves in consideration of the protection afforded them, individually and collectively, by the law. The monarch was always in need of a large amount of money to cover the lavish expenditures for temples and temple legacies, for costly gifts, for gigantic structures, and for the support of his immense staff of officials. In order to obtain this, heavy taxes were laid upon the

minor office-holders, the middle class, and the peasant serfs who farmed the public lands at an exorbitant metayer rent. One-fifth of his annual produce the tenant was compelled to give to the crown. For the reception of these forced contributions, granaries and magazines were erected throughout the land, and everywhere there were busy scribes who made long lists of the oxen and sheep, and corn and dates, and fruit and wine, and other products that were turned in. No matter how poor the harvest, how low the wages, the king's tax-collector was always on time in his visits to the peasants, accompanied by negroes with clubs. A fifth of even the linen made by the women belonged to the state, and was rigidly exacted. Similar taxes were levied upon the other subjects and the free citizens. Diodorus expressly mentions that every Egyptian was compelled to make an annual assessment of his property and income, to appear before his district supervisor and to prove, under penalty of death, the correctness of his valuation and the sources of his income. A picture from the time of the nineteenth dynasty confirms this. And from a papyrus which has been preserved we know that the woman Takaret, who refused to deliver up the firstlings of her flock to the crown, was hard pressed by the scribes of the governor, and was followed by them into her own house. A written protest by a mechanic, called Amenemue, illustrates the exorbitant character of these taxes. He complains that within four years he had been compelled to make the following payments, and we must admit that for a poor man of his time they are enormous. I give (from Erman, p. 179) a literal translation of the text as found on the Mallet papyrus:

"1. Hide (raw), four pieces, worth 8 uten of copper.

"2. Hide, made into a cuirass, one piece, worth 5 uten copper.

"3. Staff, inlaid work, one piece, worth 4 uten copper.

"4. Staff, one piece, worth 1 uten copper.

"5. Paper, one strip.

"6. Paper, one roll.

"7. Hoe, one, worth 2 uten copper.

"8. Corn, 2½ bushels.

"9. Flour, 2½ bushels.

"10. Paper, one roll."

Of course, taxes were paid as reluctantly in old Egypt as they are to-day, and when an assessment was deemed too high, a protest was made. But the state was not likely to make any return, or rebate. When the

unusual did happen, the property to be returned seldom saw its owner, but usually stuck to the fingers of one of the numerous sub-officials, through whose hands it had to pass, and who thus insured himself against a possible deficiency in his salary. But this did not prevent the state from collecting the tax due on a returned ass from the unhappy one whose claim had been recognized, but who never had seen his ass again. Such occurrences were only too frequent in the later kingdom.

The original strength and vigor of the Egyptian nation began to languish beneath the heavy burdens laid upon it. Religion, instead of building up, supporting, and renewing the national life, broke down the last bulwarks and unscrupulously gathered in spoils from king and people for the honor of the gods; that is, the profit of the priests. Whilst on the western banks of the Nile gigantic temples rose toward the skies to perpetuate the glory of the Pharaohs, whilst a highly developed material culture pervaded all classes of society, the intellectual and moral life of the nation was becoming entombed in dead traditionalism. The reformation which was attempted by Chuenaten (Amenophis III.) came too late. The national pride which once pulsed throughout the commonwealth was extinct. The free nation of local nobles and tillers of the ground became a mass of cringing office holders and oppressed serfs, and immorality poisoned and dissolved the beautiful and tender bonds of family life. The priests had crowned their edifice, and firmly held the reins of power in their hands. But a whole nation, with all its splendid endowments, its indefatigable industry, and its contented happiness, had been ruined. The proud inscriptions on the monuments find a sad commentary in the oft-repeated words, "The people are starving, and have no bread."

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

## PROFESSOR HIRSCH GRAETZ.

BY A. S. I.

From *The Jewish Messenger*, New York, September 18, 1891.

THE death of Professor Graetz, which was cabled from Munich on Sept. 10th, has come with startling suddenness. Under date of July 27th, he wrote with hopefulness of his new edition of the Old Testament, which was ready for the press. With

the completion of his "History of the Jews" and his "Critical Edition of the Bible," a certain symmetry has been given to his career. Unlike Zacharias Frankel, whose published books were largely introductions or first parts, and whose literary works, however valuable, were fragmentary and incomplete, his friend and associate Graetz was more fortunate in giving the stamp of completeness to his productions.

Graetz, born in the Duchy of Posen on Nov. 5th, 1817, was trained as rabbi, but showing no great aptitude for the pulpit, he became a private teacher at Nicolsburg under the patronage of Samson Raphael Hirsch, to whom his first work was dedicated, "Gnosticism and Judaism" (Krotoschin: 1846). Graetz was to develop in after years from the standpoint of Nicolsburg. Some years later he went to Berlin, where he endured many privations as teacher, but found leisure to write noteworthy essays to *Frankel's Monthly* on Talmudic and Jewish historical themes; and when the Breslau Seminary was opened in 1854, he was called to the chair of Jewish history and Bible exegesis—a field to which he consecrated his life.

It was in 1852 when he began to publish his "History of the Jews," which was finished in 1876. The work, of a singularly brilliant and comprehensive character, at once challenged attention. Criticised here and there for an expression or an hypothesis, the industry, the erudition, and the breadth of view aroused profound esteem and raised the work as a whole to the rank of a classic in its field. The impetus given of late years to the study of Jewish history in Germany can be largely traced to Graetz. The animated style, the ready knowledge of materials, that marvellous genius which placed events in juxtaposition and showed the play of cause and effect in the onward march of a solitary people, no less than the warm sympathy for the spiritual aim and teachings of Judaism, and the trenchant denunciation of shams and untruths—invest the volumes of Graetz's History with rare fascination. Disciples had previously told the tale—here was the master whose message was fullest and best.

In his other department—that of Bible exegesis—Graetz has displayed a remarkable fertility of critical resources, but his work has manifestly been less popular. It has appealed to the student, not the general public. His critical genius here has been less constructive, and cannot be followed with so much confidence. His conjectures and suggestions are often wonderful flashes,

however  
old versi  
tive scho  
and new  
possess  
the inte  
passage  
his new  
bodying  
revised  
occupat

With  
promin  
era in  
and Jel  
lands.  
Geiger  
Philipp  
one by  
these l  
least il  
scholar  
call G

It s  
parted  
tinued  
indeed  
much  
the te  
and c  
cousta  
of gen  
and t  
part

"A C  
ism a  
that  
a dec  
was l

Gr  
stimu  
dent  
ties,  
critic  
He  
in h  
tory  
delig  
expo  
ally  
cal,  
He

I  
orie  
his,  
Wh  
I a  
fast  
his  
Th

however. They are usually based upon the old versions and display a wide and exhaustive scholarship. If many of his hypotheses and new readings fail of acceptance, many possess undoubted critical value and add to the intelligibility of disputed or obscure passages of Holy Writ. The appearance of his new critical edition of the Bible, embodying his latest emendations, new and revised, will furnish at least an agreeable occupation to his critics.

With Graetz's passing away, scarcely one prominent name is left to recall the golden era in German Judaism. Steinschneider and Jellinek stand alone in German-speaking lands. Sachs, Rapoport, Krochmal, Fürst, Geiger, Frankel, S. R. Hirsch, Zunz, Philippon, Dukes, and now Graetz have one by one departed. Happily some of these have left their disciples, and not the least illustrious among the younger Jewish scholars abroad are the men who can proudly call Graetz their teacher.

It seems but a short time now since I parted from him, whose three years' continued friendship and instruction had been indeed a precious privilege. He recognized much more clearly than his contemporaries the tendencies which were giving new form and character to Judaism; and it was his constant regret that in America the want of genuine scholarship on the part of leaders and the fondness for sensationalism on the part of the public were likely to produce "A Comedy of Errors" in American Judaism and a "Tempest" besides. I know that he would have gladly come to America a decade or two ago, but the opportunity was lost.

Graetz's method as a teacher was intensely stimulating. He liked to develop the student's own powers. He had his peculiarities, and was not complimentary to hostile critics—Geiger and Ewald, for instance. He never kept to the letter of the subject in hand, whether Talmud, Bible, or History, but illustrated it in the most vivid and delightful way, often from his own personal experiences and travels. He was occasionally caustic, frequently witty, always logical, and rarely carried away by enthusiasm. He held his feelings in strong control.

It is vain to recall and reshape the memories of twelve years ago. One sentence of his, however, has never been forgotten. When parting from him, in student fashion I asked for some special advice: "Hold fast to your History and your Bible," was his terse remark. It was as if he had said: *There at least the message is clear.*

## BIRTH OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

From *The Advance* (Cong.), Chicago, October 1, 1891.

"JACOBS, have you got your Sunday-school lesson?"

"No, Whittle, have you?"

"No, I have not looked at it."

"Well," said Mr. Moody, "I have not looked at mine, and this is Friday noon, and every moment this afternoon and to-morrow is spoken for. Now you know we can never face the children and not understand what we are going to talk about. Whittle, you select a good lesson and take the time and study it up, and then write three copies, one for each of us, and we will try it."

"But," said Major Whittle, "we have announced our lessons to the schools and they are all in different places."

"That's so! Well, it's too late to help it now; you go ahead."

The next Monday as they again met for dinner after the noon prayer-meeting, Major Whittle said:

"Moody, how did my lesson go?"

"Why, it was good, or I guess it was. I could not read a word of it, but I got through all right, and the idea is a good one. Jacobs, you write the next one, and don't wait until Friday, but begin early and make a good one."

The Monday noon following Mr. Moody seized Mr. Jacobs with both hands, exclaiming,

"Jacobs, how is it possible that I have lived with you so long and never got acquainted with you before? Why, your lesson was splendid; it was better than I could do myself. Now we've got this right, you go ahead and get the lessons up every week."

The next lesson was good, and as other schools called for copies, the Board of Managers of the Young Men's Christian Association decided in the future to have them printed, when Mr. Jacobs, stretching out both arms and bringing his hands together with a slap, exclaimed,

"Boys, what's to hinder getting all Chicago studying the same lesson? Just think of it, wouldn't that be glorious?"

Following the work of the Christian Commission came Mr. Moody's campaign of Sunday-school conventions, which drew together the best workers from all parts of the land and started each forward with clearer aims in his life work. First came Moody, Jacobs, Whittle, Reynolds and Y. M. C. A. men from Chicago. Then

later, following each other in succession, came Vincent, Eggleston, Blackall and Hazard, while the songs of Bliss and Sankey, wet with the dews of heaven, came down by the way and fused all hearts by their inspiring melodies. When Mr. Skinner was president of the Cook County Sunday-school Union, they first employed Mr. Vincent for one year. Later, when the Union dissolved, Messrs. Adams, Blackmar and Lyon bought *The Teacher* and took Mr. Vincent into their employ. For particulars of these periods Mr. Skinner and Mr. Blackmar are referred to.

How often, when oppressed by his disabilities and by his lack of reliable financial support, Mr. Moody has said, Oh, if I had the education of some of these city ministers, with their large salaries, what could I not accomplish for the Master!

Mr. Vincent came into the Sunday-school work with a finished education, and after being still further prepared when the Methodists gave him their support, then he rose in a career that for strength of organization, vastness of accomplishment and beauty of its Chautauqua has led and enlightened the whole world. WITNESS.

#### END OF THE MACQUEARY CASE.

From *The Standard of the Cross* (Epis.), Philadelphia, October 3, 1891.

CLEVELAND, O., Sept. 26th, 1891.

THE MacQueary case, so far as the official action of the Church and its representatives is concerned, has at last found a termination. The following letter, bearing date Sept. 22d, was sent to Bishop Leonard:

"Right Reverend and Dear Sir.—The third and the last sentence you pronounced upon me leaves me the alternative of resigning from the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church, or of being restored thereto, by complying with the conditions of restoration prescribed. I have determined not to make the promise required of me, for if I were to do so I would thereby admit that the ecclesiastical powers had a right to impose the sentence upon me, and this I shall never admit. Besides, even if I could conscientiously make the required promise, I still hold the opinions condemned. Nothing has been said or done during the past year to disprove these opinions; but, on the contrary, much has happened to confirm them, and I doubt not that further investigation and study will more completely establish them, for the Church seems to have nothing but denunciations and excommunications to offer in support of her dogmas. For such reasons I renounce the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and ask that my renunciation thereof be at once formally noted by the ecclesiastical authorities. I am very respectfully,

"HOWARD MACQUEARY.

"To the Rt. Rev. WILLIAM A. LEONARD, D.D., Bishop of Ohio."

In accordance with his request, Mr. MacQueary has been deposed from the ministry, the deposition being pronounced at Trinity Cathedral, Cleveland, after the evening service on Friday, Sept. 25th. It is announced that Mr. MacQueary has entered the Universalist body and will accept the charge of a congregation in Saginaw, Michigan. "Then had the churches rest."

#### PARAGRAPHIC.

For two guineas a buyer in a Bristol (England) auction-room recently secured the last letter that Dickens wrote. It is as follows:

"It would be quite inconceivable to me—but for your letter—that any reasonable reader could possibly attach a scriptural reference to a passage in a book of mine, reproducing a much abused social figure of speech, impressed into all sorts of service on all sorts of inappropriate occasions, without the faintest connection of it with its original source. I am truly shocked to find that any reader can make the mistake.

"I have always striven in my writings to express veneration for the life and lessons of our Saviour, because I feel it; and because I rewrote that history for my children—every one of whom knew it from having it repeated to them long before they could read, and almost as soon as they could speak.

"But I have never made proclamation of this from the house-tops."—*The Christian Union*.

It is said that Richard Baxter, in reviewing his life, related that in his early years the miraculous evidences for Christianity influenced him most; in his middle life the prophetic and historical; but in his later years, the fitness of Christianity to give rest to his spirit was to him the most convincing evidence.—*The Churchman*.

REV. HUGH PRICE HUGHES, the brilliant London Methodist, is credited with this witicism: "A committee at your back is a very good thing, but one on your back isn't. I am of the opinion of William Jay of Bath, that if the building of the ark had been left to a committee it wouldn't be done yet."—*Christian Herald*.

THE Bishop of Derry, who has all but attained the "threescore years and ten," has been invited to cross the Atlantic for the purpose of giving a series of lectures in New York during next Lent. He has, we understand, accepted the invitation. The subject of the lectures is to be "The Evidences of Christianity," which is rather a large order. Dr. Alexander will doubtless single out some department of the vast theme upon which to dilate in New York City. The Bishop of Derry is an Irishman, and Irishmen in the way of travel are able to do what other men shrink from. The Bishop of Derry is eloquent without being diffuse, which we cannot say of many of his fellow countrymen. There are certain poetic touches which occur in his sermons, heights which catch the sunlight of a brighter world, which are rendered the more beautiful because they are surrounded by a good deal of solid thought, and are not the mere frothy effervescence of a runaway tongue. We congratulate the trustees of Columbia College upon their choice of a Lenten lecturer, and trust that the Bishop of Derry may have health and strength to carry out his intention.—*Literary Churchman*.

LI  
GOSPEL-C  
ITY. A  
of the  
tury.  
Modern  
New Y  
365, 8v

What  
clusions  
the spirit  
scholar,  
arly spir  
question,  
departme  
with the  
met with  
of treatm  
this treat  
work, an  
results.  
critic wit  
cal Gosp  
Gospel,  
nean "n  
tradition  
question  
Gospels,  
to separa  
of these  
the sup  
voice fro  
But he c  
is great  
the essen  
ing the  
pugnabl  
His d  
writings  
same as  
of the c  
the sam  
selection  
no writi  
out by  
hold in  
to eleva  
Scriptur  
books.  
party h  
the othe  
establis  
common  
all, the  
coming  
Church  
standar  
review  
that the  
books;  
Gospel  
also of  
there v  
pels in  
and au  
last qu  
he esta  
collecti  
in its c  
In r  
accepts  
servati



## LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

GOSPEL-CRITICISM AND HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY. A Study of the Gospels and of the History of the Gospel-Canon during the Second Century. With a Consideration of the Results of Modern Criticism. By ORELLO CONE, D.D. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1891. Pp. xii., 365, 8vo, \$1.75.

Whatever feeling one may have about the conclusions of this book, no one can help admiring the spirit of it. It is evidently the work of a scholar, and it is written throughout in the scholarly spirit—fair, judicial, and thorough. The question, too, is one of the most important in the department of biblical learning, being concerned with the historical bases of Christianity, and it has met with a corresponding fulness and carefulness of treatment from biblical scholars. The writer of this treatise shows his acquaintance with all this work, and his book is a good summing up of their results. His attitude is that of a conservative critic with reference to the origin of the Synoptical Gospels, non-committal toward the Fourth Gospel, with an inclination to accept the Johannine "nucleus" of the Gospel, but to reject the traditional authorship. In regard to the main question of the historical trustworthiness of the Gospels, he holds that it is the work of criticism to separate historical from unhistorical components of these writings, and that it has already set aside the supernatural birth, the transfiguration, the voice from heaven at the baptism and the like. But he contends that the positive result of criticism is greater, bringing "out into greater distinctness the essentials of the Gospel history, and establishing the kernel of the history of Jesus in an inextinguishable position."

His definition of what is meant by canonical writings, showing that it means very much the same as "classical," is capital, and in his history of the canon he shows that it was established by the same unconscious process as determines the selection of classical works. At first there were no writings, and such as were gradually brought out by the circumstances of the times were not held in any reverence, there being no disposition to elevate any Christian writings to the rank of Scripture, which was held by the Old Testament books. There were parties in the Church, and one party had no disposition to accept the writings of the other; the spirit of catholicity, which should establish a common standard of the faith and a common Scripture, was a later growth; and above all, there was the expectation of a speedy second coming, which made a narrow horizon for the Church in which there was no call for any written standard such as the New Testament. He gives a review of writings of the second century, showing that the authors esteemed oral tradition above any books; that in their citation of the facts of the Gospel history they used the Four Gospels, but also other records of the same events; and that there was certainly no disposition to set the Gospels in a place by themselves as specially inspired and authoritative accounts. It was not until the last quarter of the century that a canon began to be established, and even then it was a different collection from our present canon, and unsettled in its character.

In regard to the synoptical problem, Dr. Cone accepts what may be regarded as the view of conservative criticism. According to this, our pres-

ent Gospel of Mark, with the so-called Logia of Matthew, are the original writings from which came the Synoptical Gospels. There are evidently other sources, from one of which are taken the portions peculiar to Luke's narrative, and the accounts of the birth and childhood of our Lord in Matthew and Luke are from different and variant sources. The one fact which shows that the Synoptical Gospels are thus interdependent is the verbal coincidence in so many places of them all. This verbal resemblance makes it simply impossible that they should be independent reports of oral tradition, and assures us that they must be interdependent, or dependent on some common written source. With this is combined the statement of Papias that Mark wrote a gospel after the story told by Peter, and that Matthew wrote out in Aramaic the Logia of Jesus. This Gospel of Mark there is no reason to distinguish from our second Gospel; and, on the other hand, all the accounts that we have of any gospel by Matthew are to the effect that it was written in Aramaic, which excludes the supposition that it was our first Gospel. Further, Dr. Cone supposes that Mark was written at Rome about the year 69 A.D. Matthew he supposes to have been written by a Jew of the dispersion some time after the year 70. Luke he thinks may have been written by the companion of Paul, about the year 90, and on Gentile-Christian soil. Both of these compositions show their dependence on Mark and on the Logia of Matthew.

In the discussion of the question of the Fourth Gospel, the writer indicates his own point of view, when he says that the problem is not to be solved offhand by radical criticism, nor to be pronounced upon *ex cathedra* by conservative dogmatism. Accordingly, he presents the incontestable facts, and maintains a wise caution in regard to results. These facts are, first, the indecisive character of the external evidences of its origin; secondly, the marked difference from the other Gospels in regard to the external events, scenes, and times of our Lord's ministry, but especially in regard to the character of our Lord's teaching and person; thirdly, the dominance of certain ideas and tendencies in the teaching, and even in the representation of events; fourthly, the profound spirituality and verisimilitude of many of the sayings, precluding the idea of invention; fifthly, the difference between this Gospel and the Apocalypse, and, on the other hand, the resemblance of the Gospel to the first Epistle of John. On the whole, the writer thinks that it cannot be the work of an apostle, but that it has a basis of apostolic authority in certain sayings of Jesus handed down from the Apostle John. The author had a relation to the apostle somewhat analogous to that of the first evangelist to Matthew, and he wrote sometime in the second quarter of the second century.

We agree entirely with Dr. Cone in regard to the difficulty and complexity of the problem, which is sufficiently set forth in his presentation of the facts. But he omits two very important factors: First, the fact that the Fourth Gospel is identical with the same in the Diatessaron of Tatian, which forces the time back to the second, if not the first decade of the second century; and secondly, the wide gap which separates this from every writing of that century that has come down to us. There are difficulties—and grave difficulties they are—in the way of assigning the Gospel to its reputed author; but it is certainly no less difficult to ascribe this profoundly spiritual Gospel to an unknown person of a century barren of religious ideas and of literary skill.

Dr. Cone devotes a chapter to the eschatological discourses of Jesus, a subject of the greatest importance. He finds that everywhere else Jesus spiritualized the Messianic conception of the Jews, while in these discourses He is supposed to have taken up those conceptions in their most literal sense. And he concludes, therefore, that they are founded upon certain prophetic teachings of our Lord in regard to the future of His kingdom, which were in harmony with the generally spiritual character of His teaching, but which have been given a Jewish-Messianic coloring by His disciples. That He should have taught His followers to expect His coming on the clouds of heaven, attended by hosts of angels, and that this coming would be attended by a world judgment, seems to the author impossible. And there would be certainly a suspicious difference between this and the rest of His teaching, a falling away from the spiritual height of His whole ministry just at the climax of it, if we had to attribute this language to Him in a literal sense. But it does not seem necessary to do this. This language is just that employed by the prophets in depicting what they see to be a Divine interference in human events, but in which the only things appearing to human vision are the human factors, the natural events of war, of storm, of plague, of national disaster and overthrow. The prophet sees in these things a power behind the veil, a coming of the Divine into the human course of things, which he clothes in these imaginative forms. Every element of apocalyptic description in the discourses of Jesus can be paralleled in the Old Testament prophecies of such events, as the destruction of cities, in which evidently there was no expectation that the language should be taken literally. Moreover, the author himself cites one word which is decisive, so it would seem, in favor of this view. In Jesus' answer to the question of the high priest, whether He were the Christ, He says, "Ap' arti (English version, hereafter) ye shall see the Son of man seated at right hand of power, and coming upon the clouds of heaven." Now this note of time does not mean "hereafter"—that is, at some future time, but "henceforth," or from this time forward. This distinct assertion that the manifestation of Christ in power and His coming in the clouds of heaven is to begin from that very time, shows that it is not to be taken literally, but that it is a figurative description of the spiritual power to be wielded by Him beginning with the time of His suffering. And this interpretation is confirmed by the fact that the same language is used of His coming in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, inasmuch as it shows that the coming is not a single event, but the Divine and supernatural meaning given to several events, and even to periods of time.

In the chapters on dogmatic tendencies in the Gospels, and on the Old Testament in the Gospels, Dr. Cone finds that the authors wrote as men of their time, subject to its influences, and adopting its methods. Matthew, for instance, wrote as a Jewish Christian, and Luke as a Pauline Christian, and their Gospels are so far tendency writings, but without any conscious purpose to color, or shape, or select their material, so as to maintain their views. And in their interpretation of the Old Testament, they adopted the allegorizing method common to their time, and by which they were able to obtain from it material in confirmation of their ideas. It ought to be said in modification of this view, however, that the writings of the New Testament show comparatively little of

this tendency, and are sober and sane compared with other Jewish writings of their period.

This quality in them is distinctly recognized in the chapter on the Gospels as histories, in which the author sums up the most important results. "It should be kept in mind," he says, "in considering the perils to which the synoptists were exposed from oral tradition or from any other source, that they appear to have been men of exceptionally sound and sober judgment. This quality is evinced in the nature of their writings, and is a factor in the historical character of these which cannot be too highly estimated." But while "they contain historical reminiscences of Jesus, vivid pictures of His life, striking sketches of His character, and, above all, authentic reproductions of His great teachings," there are also discernible in them distinct Jewish-Christian and Pauline-Christian elements; "what reverence, faith, and wonder had wrought of transformation in His tradition, and what the glamour of poetry had wrought in His legend." This mixture of historical and unhistorical elements makes it necessary for criticism to separate and discriminate, a delicate and difficult task, but one which the writer thinks cannot be neglected nor ignored by the scholar. It is in the positiveness with which Dr. Cone himself proceeds to perform this task, and apply the pruning knife to the record, that we think he fails to keep himself within the bounds of sober criticism. But in his last chapter, on Criticism and Historical Christianity, he shows that the critical process tends to confirm historical Christianity by establishing the general credibility of the Synoptical Gospels as to the essential teachings and the character of Jesus. So far as Christianity means that "Jesus of Nazareth lived; that He was a personality of unsurpassed moral and spiritual greatness; that He taught a religion based on the doctrine that God is the Father of all men, and that all men are brothers, the central, practical precept of which was love to God and man; that He lived a blameless, worshipful life of consecration and service, in which His great teachings were eminently illustrated; that He performed works which in His age were regarded as wonders; that after an amazing and brilliant career of a few months in Galilee He was crucified in Jerusalem; and that He was thereupon in some way manifested to His disciples as victorious over death;" it finds in criticism a helpful ally. Both the positive and negative sides of this statement show that the writer is himself a good example of what he finds in the Gospels—one who writes as a man of his own times and out of his special environment as a liberal Christian. But he has produced a valuable and scholarly book.

E. P. GOULD.

EPISCOPAL DIVINITY SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA.

HISTORISCH-KRITISCHE EINLEITUNG IN DIE BÜCHER DES ALTEN TESTAMENTS hinsichtlich ihrer Entstehung und Sammlung von Dr. A. KUENEN, Professor zu Leiden. Autorisirte deutsche Ausgabe von Professor Dr. Th. Weber (†). Erster Theil, Zweites Stück. DIE HISTORISCHEN BÜCHER DES ALTEN TESTAMENTS. Leipzig: O. R. Reisland; New York: Gustav Stechert, 1890. 8vo, pp. viii., 223, 6 marks.

This work, as is seen from its title, is a second part, and is entirely dependent for its conclusions upon the author's theory of the composition and origin of the Hexateuch presented in the first part. There Dr. Kuenen, we surmise, according

to his well-known theory of the composition of the Pentateuch, Josiah at B.C. In the historical books, any way of these things, the Kings, were a different to differ ment, and hence tors. The follo half of the il. 11-26; part; xii. 1-xviii. 5; 1-xviii. 1; xxxi. in xx., and than the onomy I. xxiv.; xlationshi 3-25, and of Deut. Sam. vii. vii. 26-v. 1-13; xi. As a r and I am of the b Deuterom Saul, an (See the incorp time of f probably After th who won the histo Kings, n rial of J xxiv. 7. first hal writer v Sam. vii.

This c ough an The aut many in statemen character histories ferent p Their d jecture. glosses easily a history however we belie these h stantial accepta hind th and dat and wil in deter ings. I to an u disposit

to his well-known views, has assigned the Deuteronomist document of the Hexateuch to the age of Josiah and the priest's code to the fifth century B.C. In this part he proceeds to analyze the historical books on the assumption that whatever in any way reflects the distinctive teachings or ideas of these documents must be synchronous with them. Thus the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, which are regarded as constituting properly a continuous history, are found to exhibit different strata of literary material corresponding to different stages of Israel's religious development, and thus belonging to different periods, and hence the work of different authors or editors. The books of Samuel, for example, show the following: To a historical writer of the first half of the seventh century B.C. are due 1 Sam. i., ii. 11-26; iii. 1-vii. 2a; ix. 1-x. 7, 9-16; xi. in part; xiii. 1-7, 15b-xiv. 51; xvi. 14-23; xvii. 1-xviii. 5, 6-30 (LXX.); xix. 1-17; xxi. 2-10; xxii. 1-xxiii. 13; . . . xxv.; xxvii. 1-xxviii. 2; xxix.-xxx. in part; 2 Sam. i. 1-v. 16; vi.; viii.; ix.-xx., and possibly 1 Sam. xvii. 1-xviii. 5. Later than these yet earlier than the time of Deuteronomy 1 Sam. xx. 1b-xxi. 1, 11-16; xxiii. 14-xxiv.; xxvi.; 2 Sam. v. 17-25. Of uncertain relationship to Deuteronomy 1 Sam. xv.; xxviii. 3-25, and xxxi. in its present form. Of the period of Deuteronomy 1 Sam. ii. (1-10?) 27-36; 2 Sam. vii.; of the same period but later, 1 Sam. vii. 2b-viii. 22; x. 17-26; xi. in part; xii.; xvi. 1-13; xix. 18-xx. 1a; also 1 Sam. x. 8; xiii. 15a.

As a result in respect to Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings, there is first a pre-exilic author of the history of the Kings, who in the spirit of Deuteronomy worked over the history of Samuel, Saul, and David as he found it compiled by others. (See the analysis just mentioned.) Whether he incorporated into his work any traditions of the time of the Judges is doubtful. A younger author probably joined Judges ii. 6-xvi. to his work. After this there comes another editor or author who worked over the material again and separated the history into the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, making the additions to the previous material of Judges i. 1-ii. 5; xvii.-xxi.; 2 Sam. xxi.-xxiv. This writer most probably flourished in the first half of the fifth century B.C. Another later writer works over Judges xix.-xxi. and adds 1 Sam. vii. ff.

This critical analysis is supported by a most thorough and minute examination of these books. The author appears lynx-eyed, and brings to light many interesting phenomena of expression and statement. In favor of his results is the plain character of these books as compilations of early histories and stories, written frequently from different points of view. They also are anonymous. Their date, too, must always be a matter of conjecture. They show likewise in their present form glosses and inaccuracies, and thus they may be easily adjusted to Dr. Kuenen's view of Israel's history and the material of the Hexateuch. If, however, Dr. Kuenen is here radically in error, as we believe him to be, his conclusions concerning these historical books rest at once upon no substantial foundation, and have little or no claim for acceptance. The history which he has placed behind these writings gives the force to his analysis and dates. His work, however, cannot be ignored, and will always be full of suggestion and helpful in determining the true character of these writings. In it, however, literary criticism is carried to an unwarranted extreme. There is too great a disposition to "cook" the narratives examined,

and assume on mere hypothesis that words and paragraphs opposed to certain theories are merely the insertion of later editors. A certain artificiality is also ascribed to the writers, depriving their narratives of genuine historic worth. The number of the Judges recorded, for example, is supposed to be determined by a desire to conform to the number twelve.

The books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah are treated in a manner similar to those just mentioned.

They are regarded as constituting originally one work. Their author had in mind in the first part of his writing nothing less than a reconstruction of the history of his people during the centuries before the exile, in order to harmonize it with the priests' code. He had, however, predecessors in this work, of whose writings he made use. The history after the exile was treated in the same spirit. This writer belonged to the Grecian period of Jewish history. The two books Ruth and Esther are regarded by Dr. Kuenen as unhistorical. The former he considers a beautiful tale of religious instruction, written in the second half of the fifth century B.C., designed primarily to teach the principle upon which a Gentile woman might be incorporated into Israel. The latter, a work of fiction, whose object is to commend the feast of Purim, is assigned to the second century B.C.

EDWARD L. CURTIS.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

THE GENERAL EPISTLES OF ST. JAMES AND ST. JUDE. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham; formerly Fellow and Senior Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford. (The Expositor's Bible.) New York: A. C. Armstrong & Co. Pp. x., 476, \$1.50.

This book is a worthy addition to the excellent series of biblical expositions to which it belongs; for while it is not as brilliant in style as Smith's two volumes on Isaiah nor so original in its views and conclusions, it shows a careful study and a strong grasp of the epistles of which it treats and a deep sympathy with the ideas which it expounds. As to this sort of biblical handbook, there can be no question as to its value in aiding the clergy to get at the ideas of the biblical writers as a whole; for there is always the temptation to take them piecemeal, in paragraphs, and chapters, or even single verses, and to set forth this or that isolated thought as the truth which the writer holds, whereas it is not the truth which he had in mind, but a mere fraction of it, which by itself does not convey the author's meaning at all. It is strange that while this is recognized immediately as true in the case of secular writers, it should so often be neglected when one is dealing with the writers of the Bible. Such books as this under review will always do good in bringing the mind back to the comprehension of the fact that each inspired writer has one point in view throughout his book, and that all his expressions have their true meaning only in relation with that central thought. Whether we agree or not with the expositor's conclusions, we cannot follow him systematically in his exposition without getting somewhat deeper into the mind and thought of the sacred author. Thus much we may say as to the value of the book before us as a whole, and its usefulness for those whose business it is to preach the whole truth of the Bible. It has, however, also another interest for those who have the scholar's

sympathy with the critical questions involved in the study of the Bible; for Dr. Plummer naturally prefaces his expositions with a brief statement of his position as regards the authenticity and authority of his text; and from a man of his well-known scholarship and recognized authority, we cannot fail to get something on these points which is well worth considering. In the introduction he treats of the Catholic Epistles in general, maintaining that they bear this title not as a designation and defence of their orthodoxy and canonicity, nor as a sign of their applicability generally to both Jews and Gentiles, but because they are addressed to Christians universally, without regard to local church relations. In this series of epistles, that of St. James is by most authorities given the first place, while that of St. Jude is placed last, "because of its comparative insignificance, and because it was not at first universally admitted." Dr. Plummer's view is that both these epistles present us with that Judaic form of Christianity which was really the complement of the teaching of St. Paul, although quite capable by exaggeration of being transformed into its opposite. In the special discussion of St. James, which follows this introduction, we find an admirably clear statement of the expositor's critical position as to its authenticity and canonicity. That the epistle remained unknown for some time to many of the early churches, and, when it became generally known, that it was long uncertain as to whether the writer was really an apostle and had canonical authority, are the grounds upon which suspicion has been thrown upon the book. But Dr. Plummer thinks that it is not strange that such an epistle should have remained unknown for some time to the Church at large; for it was addressed by a Jew, whose influence was limited to Jerusalem, to Jewish Christians, who by their conservatism were cut off from free intercourse with other Christians. It was intended to be read in Christian synagogues, and would, therefore, be but slowly communicated to other more liberally minded Christian assemblies. There is no evidence, as even Harnack shows, that the earliest authorities on the canon rejected it, but their silence simply shows that they had never heard of it; and yet the epistle was not wholly unknown at a very early date. Dr. Plummer cites Bishop Lightfoot as decidedly of the opinion that it was known to Clement of Rome, and he himself thinks it was certainly known to Hermas in the first half, and possibly the first quarter of the second century. The conclusive evidence, however, is found in the fact that the epistle is included in the ancient Syriac version of the second century, known as the Peshitto. Adding to this the internal evidence, which shows the character of the epistle to be in close harmony with the character of St. James, the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and of that special type of Christians to whom it was addressed, in Dr. Plummer's opinion, the weight of testimony is preponderantly against the charge of forgery and in favor of the authenticity of the book. The difficult question of the authorship of the epistle is then taken up and presented in its various phases. Which St. James wrote the epistle? Was it James the Apostle, the son of Zebedee and brother of John the Apostle, or James the Apostle, the son of Alphaeus, known as James the Little, or was it James, the brother of the Lord, the Bishop of the Church of Jerusalem, and brother of the Jude who wrote the epistle? Into a choice between these three the whole inquiry resolves itself. The earliest MSS. of the Peshitto, dating

from the fifth to the eighth century, attribute it to James the Apostle, and later editors of this version certainly ascribe it to the son of Zebedee; but Dr. Plummer finds so many difficulties in the way of this view that he is constrained to assign the epistle to James the Just, the brother of Jesus and Bishop of Jerusalem, and thus refuses it the mark of apostolic authorship, though bringing it into close and living connection with the personal teaching of the Lord, and making it only second in rank to the purely apostolic writings. In Dr. Plummer's view, therefore, the epistle is authentic and canonical and apostolic in spirit, if not strictly in name. As to St. Jude the same lines of inquiry are followed, as the difficulties here are very much the same as in the case of St. James. The epistle remained long unknown, and when it became known the authority of its writer remained for some time doubtful, and in addition it cites the apocryphal Book of Enoch, which was supposed to be unlikely of an inspired apostle. Dr. Plummer, however, sees no great force in the objection that the epistle was so long unknown, the same considerations prevailing here as in the case of St. James' epistle, to explain the silence regarding it. The one really strong evidence against the epistle is its absence from the Peshitto, but this seems to be offset by its presence in the Muratorian Canon and in the old Latin version. Tertullian and Augustine speak of it plainly as the work of the Apostle Jude. Clement of Alexandria quotes and comments upon it as Scripture. Origen accepted it. Athanasius places it without question among the Canonical Scriptures, and Didymus of Alexandria and Jerome condemn those who oppose it. This mass of evidence leads even Harnack to admit its general acceptance about A.D. 200, and induces Dr. Plummer to regard it as sufficiently proved that the Epistle of St. Jude is an authentic product of the apostolic age. Who, then, is the St. Jude who wrote the epistle? Was it "Judas not Iscariot, also called Thaddaeus, or Judas one of the four brethren of the Lord? Although Tertullian and Augustine speak of the writer as an apostle, there are strong probabilities against this opinion. The writer would scarcely have neglected to mention the fact of his apostleship as giving greater weight to his words, for, unlike St. Paul, he was far from being a well-known personage throughout the churches. His only personal claim upon the respect of those to whom he writes is that he is the "brother of James," whose epistle was probably well known in the circle which he addressed. Dr. Plummer, therefore, concludes that the epistle is the work of the Judas who is mentioned as one of the four brethren of the Lord, and that it was probably written before A.D. 81, when Domitian ascended the throne. Thus both of these epistles are traced back to the immediate family circle of Jesus, and in the ethical simplicity of their thought and expression probably reflect something of the characteristic spirit and manner of the Master Himself. For both letters, as Dr. Plummer says, are Palestinian in origin and Jewish in tone, and are almost entirely practical in their aim. They show us Christianity as a high-minded, ethical conviction, chiefly occupied with correcting conduct and inspiring men with exalted views of life and duty. The Greek spirit of systematic and logical speculation had not yet mingled itself with the simpler Hebrew spirit, and moved it to transform its convictions into doctrines and arguments. The change had to come, but it is something to be able to see what Christianity was before it did come. We may well be thankful to Dr. Plummer

for helping  
what these  
ness of the

BROOK

HAND-  
Zweiter  
an die  
Bearbe  
Zweite  
York:  
marks.

This so  
the Epist  
begins at  
exegesis  
of the p  
upon, an  
abundant  
confusing  
much gr  
with its  
author's  
narrower  
should c  
and sho  
work, is  
book of  
commen  
much s  
lexicon  
of which  
phases,  
meaning  
especial  
exclud

It m  
item of  
that So  
commen  
Winer"

Before  
Epistle  
it may  
establis  
the tex  
he tak  
dent, t  
logical

The  
gested  
passage  
one b  
one b  
vision  
of one  
one.  
lish r  
last c  
propri  
vs. 16  
interp  
ception  
points  
body  
body  
ing o  
of the  
cal be  
Sel  
ange  
Gen.



for helping us to understand more clearly just what these simple Christian men, in the earnestness of their faith, felt and thought.

H. RICHARD HARRIS.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

HAND-COMMENTAR ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT. Zweiter Band. Erste Abtheilung. Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher und an die Korinther. Bearbeitet von PAUL WILHELM SCHMIEDEL. Zweite Hälfte. Freiburg-i.B.: Mohr; New York: Stechert, 1891. 8vo, pp. 113-276, 3.20 marks.

This second part of Schmiedel's commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians begins at the second verse of 1 Cor. ix., carries the exegesis through 2 Corinthians, contains a register of the proper names, words, and themes touched upon, and at the end a *Vorwort*. Owing to the abundant use of abbreviations, sometimes a little confusing, the amount of matter in the volume is much greater than would ordinarily be associated with its one hundred and seventy-five pages. The author's aim to give a precise explanation in the narrowest conceivable space, an explanation that should embody the full results of scientific research and should stimulate the reader to independent work, is realized in large measure. A page of the book often weighs as much as ten pages of other commentaries. It cannot be appreciated without much study. Knowledge of the New Testament lexicon and New Testament grammar, on the use of which the author in his Preface lays just emphasis, is constantly assumed. Discussion of the meaning of words, excepting those which are of especial importance, theologically or otherwise, is excluded.

It may be mentioned here incidentally, as an item of special interest to New Testament students, that Schmiedel, according to the Preface in his commentary, is preparing a revised edition of Winer's New Testament grammar.

Before passing to the exegesis of the Corinthian Epistles, which can be but briefly characterized, it may be noticed that the author departs from the established custom of commenting on the words of the text in their order. In more difficult passages, he takes first that word which is most independent, then that which follows most naturally and logically.

The character of Schmiedel's work can be suggested by reference to some of the more difficult passages. 1 Cor. x. 17 he translates: "Since it is one bread (which we break), we, the many, are one body." This differs from the American revision in putting the emphasis not on the *existence* of one bread, but upon the fact that the bread is *one*. The ordinary construction (that of the English revision) is rejected as inconsistent with the last clause of the verse and as yielding an inappropriate thought. The abrupt transition from vs. 16 to vs. 17 may suggest that the latter is an interpolation, but perhaps points to a peculiar conception of the Lord's Supper. The blood of Jesus points to His death as securing salvation; the body of Christ, on the contrary, is the mystical body of the exalted One. Accordingly the breaking of the one bread does not symbolize the death of the earthly body, but the oneness of the mystical body in its relation to each individual member.

Schmiedel suggests that the difficult reference to angels in 1 Cor. xi. 10 be explained with the aid of Gen. vi. 1f. The limitation to married women

may be in form only. He does not think it needful, with Baur and others, to drop the verse as an interpolation.

The apparent conflict between xi. 5 and xiv. 34 is harmonized, with Hofman, by limiting the former passage to family gatherings. Heinrich's view that xiv. 34 refers to forward and impertinent questions is regarded as improbable.

Schmiedel regards *θραύξεν* in 2 Cor. ii. 14 as a causative verb. "Thanks be unto God, who always causes us to triumph in Christ—i.e., in the work of Christ." This meaning, he thinks, is variously called for, as against the common interpretation. The thought of Paul as being led in the procession of a conqueror, to grace that procession as an eminent trophy, has no connection with the context, and is moreover excluded by the words "through us" at the close of the verse.

These passages may be taken as samples of the book. In their discussion, as elsewhere, we find thoroughness, fairness, and independence.

Throughout the volume, separate from the exegesis, there are condensed and valuable discussions of difficult questions. Such are the excursus on the Lord's Supper, spiritual gifts, the resurrection, the atonement, and on the vision of 2 Cor. xii.

The general critical position of the Hand-Commentar need not be defined here, and space forbids any further reference to this valuable contribution of Professor Schmiedel.

GEORGE H. GILBERT.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

STUDIES IN JOHN'S GOSPEL. THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST'S DEITY. By Rev. DAVID GREGG, D.D. New York: American Tract Society. 12mo, pp. 348.

This volume appears to consist of what are known in technical homiletics as "exegetical sermons," and it follows the course of the International Sunday-school Lessons for the current half-year in twenty-four "studies," for each of which some central sentence of the weekly lesson forms a text.

If these limitations of design be borne in mind, the volume will not disappoint its readers. It were as easy as it were ungracious to find minor defects. For example, the style is often repetitious and disfigured by colloquialisms; there is a tendency to "improve" where it is very doubtful whether either the evangelist or the Holy Spirit had any didactic intention whatever; there are occasional slips of logic, as when (p. 152) from our Lord's declaration that "neither did *this* man sin nor his parents," that he should be born blind, the deduction is made that "God takes all the responsibility for the deformities which men bring with them into the world;" there is an uncritical, not to say unscholarly inclination to accept the "Acts of Pilate" and the story of the Roman Senate publicly debating the acknowledgment of Christ as one of the city's gods on the ground of His conceded resurrection (pp. 329-30); and finally there is a tendency to take for granted disputed interpretations of Scripture.

However, the imperfections just recounted, although serious, are occasional only, and not characteristic of the whole volume. These lectures are alike excellent for their apparently original purpose of pastoral instruction of an audience of ordinary culture, and for placing on the list of the useful publications of the American Tract Society. The book is fresh, practical, and thoroughly or-

thodox, according to the older type. Hardly any one could read it without spiritual quickening and advantage. But whoso would procure it should understand that it touches none of the difficult questions so long and hotly debated by critical scholars, and was never intended to be a rival of the handbooks of "Introduction," or even of commentary, which the well-furnished theological bookshelf knows so well. Sunday-school teachers will not find in it much material directly helpful in preparing for their classes, nor will advanced students get critical aid from its pages. Its place is rather among the books of devotional and practical piety, and there it is above the average.

MANCUS H. HUTTON.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY. The Biblical Evidence. By RICHARD N. DAVIES. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe; New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891. 12mo, pp. 234, 90 cents.

The author has rightly interpreted the needs of the pulpit and the pew. "As there is in the churches of America a strong current of thought toward a false idea of divine unity, a work on the 'Doctrine of the Trinity' comes in answer to a demand. It has 'been written for those who are just beginning their biblical studies;' and the aim is to 'furnish the young student of divinity with a plain, courteous, and trustworthy answer to the objections of those who reject the doctrine of a Triune Deity.'"

This book maintains in the main a sound biblical view of the Godhead; first of all laying stress on the *one* God, and distinguishing Father, Son, and Spirit as three distinct persons in the One. After presenting briefly the teaching of the Bible on the unity of God, and showing, in opposition to Dr. Channing and other Unitarians, that the personal distinctions do not contradict the truth of divine unity, he proceeds to furnish the biblical evidence for the "plurality of persons in the Godhead;" and with this branch of the subject the whole book is chiefly occupied. It is very rich in scriptural quotations from the Old and New Testaments; and the "young student of divinity" will find it to be a valuable handbook in the prosecution of theological studies.

As the author tells us, the discussion is "plain and courteous;" to a great degree it is also "trustworthy." The argument is forcible; but it loses some force from a defective conception of the difference between the New Testament and the Old Testament. That God is Father and Son and Spirit, and that Son and Spirit as to nature are co-ordinate with the Father, are truths *peculiar to Christianity*. They are not taught in the Old Testament. Our author argues at some length from "the Angel," the "Angel of God," as represented in Jacob's dream, in the wrestling of Jacob with "a man," in the blessing of Jacob pronounced on Joseph, and in the manifestation of God to Moses "in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush" (pp. 41-52) in support of the deity of Jesus Christ. The best exegesis and the best works on Old Testament biblical theology support the thought that the "Angel of the Lord" is a theophany, a transient human form of the Logos, and thus a significant type of the incarnate Son. This interpretation is in harmony with the preparatory, typical, and prefigurative character of pre-Christian revelation. If exegesis seeks to find in Genesis evidence of the Trinity on a par

with Christian revelation, the argument will fail, and by association it may neutralize the adequate evidence of the New Testament. We may also instance a groundless inference drawn from Gen. iii. 15. Our author says that "the promise of a deliverer contemplated the birth of a virgin's Son." The promised One "was to be 'the seed of the woman' alone, the woman without connection with a man, Christ was most peculiarly 'the seed of the woman,' as He had a human mother and no human father" (p. 67). It is unwarranted to reason in support of the miraculous conception of Jesus from the terms of the protevangel.

The author argues at great length and with much force from the New Testament in support of the "divinity" of Christ; but the legitimate force of the argument is weakened by its Nestorian trend. According to this method of reasoning, the two natures of Christ are associated, not members of an organic unity. Human attributes, human acts and experiences are predicated of the human nature, not of the God-man; transcendent authority, miracles and divine attributes are predicated of the divine nature, not of the personal unity. "Thus Jesus Christ as a man was known by men. As a man He is not present with His disciples; as a man He was killed by men; as a man He knew not the day and the hour of judgment. On the other hand, as God 'no man knoweth' Him; as God He is 'with' His disciples 'always'; as God no man took His life—He 'laid it down Himself'; as God He had appointed His own times for the judgment; hence must know both the day and the hour" (p. 138).

If the crucifixion must be predicated of the human nature only, if divinity in an external way supports the man on the cross, then we have only a human sacrifice for sin. Personality merely serves the purpose of holding the two natures together; and the doctrine respecting the deity of Christ has a precarious basis.

E. V. GERHART.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, REFORMED CHURCH, LANCASTER, PA.

PRIMARY DOCTRINES. Being Charges on Christian Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and on the Holy Spirit. By the late THOMAS HUBBARD VAIL, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Kansas. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. 148, 12mo, 75 cents net.

The object of the author in these charges was to subject the received formularies of the Episcopal Church to a careful examination, in order to furnish a secure basis of agreement for those who are bound by them, relegating to speculation all unsettled questions which they suggest. This is a laudable design, and if controversy could be kept rigidly to these latter only, it would be better natured and quicker in reaching results of value. Few would dispute the author's definition of Christian baptism, as far as it goes. It is "the sacrament of the confession of Christ, of church-membership, of covenanted grace." It is only when he makes the last phrase identical in meaning with "the sacrament of regeneration" that one objects to the degradation of this latter word into a mere figurative expression. In the charge "on the Holy Spirit," he alludes to the controversies which have raged around this word, and its consequent ambiguity, and expresses the wish that permission for its disuse in the offices of the Church might be had. But certainly one ought not to fear a scriptural word; and there would be danger that

in disusing means. In the New T. It is too ca too profou the phrase lent.

In his tr its signific ment of th of Christ, far, too, n contend fo to this la meaning of. In the t the sancte His faue problems untouch portan that wha Spirit; f that He s such, an by virtuo a doctrin ministry emphasi works th Altho one wil troversy fild. SEAR

In th lowing the Mag bert D. York: \$1.25.) ago, at worth and of Daniel and ce of ind to buy is prin day-se than u A H and M Harp book, to Su consi well book terest To The the pub both the Mr. fied scho sing Chur arsh

in disusing the word we might lose whatever it means. It and its synonyms are too frequent in the New Testament for us to dare to run the risk. It is too carefully chosen a word, and its meaning too profound not to cover more than is signified in the phrase which the author makes to be its equivalent.

In his treatment of the Lord's Supper he makes its signification, too, to be threefold. It is a sacrament of the "memorial of Christ," "the covenant of Christ," "the communion with Christ." So far, too, none would disagree. Only some would contend for a wider meaning than the author gives to this last phrase, and that an extension of the meaning of the word "regeneration."

In the third charge a distinction is made between the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit and His functional gifts. Although the profounder problems in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit are untouched, yet this distinction is a valid and important one. From the first flows the admission that whatever is "good" is the work of the Holy Spirit; from which the corollary may be drawn that He bears a universal relation to humanity as such, and that all (moral) good whatever is only by virtue of this relation. From the second flows a doctrine of mediation. The fact of an authorized ministry, and of prescribed rites is implied and emphasized, and it is assumed that the Holy Spirit works through this mediation.

Although having little theologic depth, this volume will be useful in narrowing the region of controversy. It is calm and judicious within its own field.

J. STEINFORT KEDNEY.

SEABURY DIVINITY SCHOOL, FARIBAULT, MINN.

#### MINOR NOTICES.

In the department of *Religious Fiction* the following books may be mentioned: *The Master of the Magicians*, by Elizabeth Stuart Phelps and Herbert D. Ward (her husband). (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., pp. 324, 16mo, \$1.25.) This very clever book appeared a year ago, and attracted much attention. It is richly worth reading. It presents a picture of Babylon and of the life and manners there in the time of Daniel, which is probably archaeologically correct and certainly extremely graphic. It is in the hope of inducing some who have not hitherto done so to buy this book and read it that this tardy notice is printed. The book should go into all our Sunday-school libraries, where it will do more good than many of the books now there.

*A King of Tyre: A Tale of the Times of Ezra and Nehemiah*, by James M. Ludlow. (New York: Harper, 12mo, pp. 298, \$1.) Like the preceding book, this one may be commended for addition to Sunday-school libraries. The story itself is of considerable interest and the historical setting is well done and very accurate. We read the whole book almost at a single sitting, and found the interest well sustained throughout.

*To the Lions: A Tale of the Early Christians*, and *The Hammer: A Story of the Maccabean Times*, are the titles of two tales by Rev. Alfred J. Church, published in New York by G. P. Putnam's Sons; both adequately illustrated and well printed. In the second story Mr. Church has been aided by Mr. Richmond Seeley. Both stories are unqualifiedly recommended to committees of Sunday-schools now planning for Christmas. They are singularly instructive, as well as interesting. Mr. Church is a master of historic fiction. His scholarship is ample and his inventiveness unfailing.

*Jabez Easterbrook: A Religious Novel*, by Joseph Hocking. (London, New York, and Melbourne: Ward, Lock & Co., 12mo, pp. 362.) This is a story which has a strong family resemblance to the inimitable "Barriers Burned Away." This will be to most educated and refined persons strong condemnation. But Mr. Hocking is not quite so absurd as the late Mr. Roe. On the contrary, he has written a far more logical and possible story. Yet the same elements are used in its construction. A pious youth falls in love with a sceptical young woman of great wealth. She repulses him at first, but he is not lightly to be shaken off. He labors to convert her and is successful. Her heart goes out to her evangelist, and they are married. The literary flavor of the book is coarse and the story is on the whole trashy.

*Leath of Jerusalem: A Story of the Time of Paul*, by Edward Payson Berry. (New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co., n.d., 12mo, pp. 388, \$1.) This story is pleasantly written, but, curiously enough, the parts in which Paul is introduced are decidedly inferior to the rest. Indeed, the difference between the speeches put in the mouth of Paul, except so far as they consist of quotations from the Acts and the Epistles, and those of the other characters is painful. If Paul had been left out entirely, the tale would be unqualifiedly praised as presenting a faithful and animated picture of the times. The scenes are laid in Jerusalem, in the wilderness of Judæa, and in Rome. There are many thrilling incidents.

*A Dead Man's Diary Written after His Decase*. (London, New York, and Melbourne: Ward, Lock & Co., pp. 218, \$1.) This book appeared anonymously, but is now known to be the work of Mr. Coulson Kernahan, a writer of no note on this side of the sea. Its contents are a bit gruesome. It is supposed to be the experiences of one who temporarily was under the power of death; and since he had in early life committed a heinous offence, he feels the pains of hell in consequence. The author had really little to say, but by means of much padding managed to produce considerable "copy," which the publishers have put in coarse print, and thus assisted to make up a book of some size. The author has not materially helped his generation, although he has not injured it; indeed, his book is in parts decidedly clever.

The following volumes are of more substantial worth: *The Reformed Church in America. Its Origin, Development, and Characteristics*. By David D. Demarest, D.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology and Sacred Rhetoric in the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J. (4th ed., revised and enlarged. New York: Board of Publication of the Reformed Church in America, 8vo, pp. xiii., 215.) The fact that this book is in its fourth edition may be taken as evidence of its adaptability to its purpose. It is, indeed, an admirable handbook for the Reformed Church in America, and should be in every family of that communion. The office-holders, both clerical and lay, should be familiar with its contents. The Reformed Church has a noble past and its present is worthy of study.

*David Brainerd, the Apostle to the North American Indians*, by Jesse Page. (New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co.) It was the making of Brainerd's reputation that he won the heart of Jonathan Edwards' daughter Jerusha, for that secured him the famous theologian as biographer, a circumstance to which his fame is to a large extent owing. The real pioneer of missionary work among the Indians (in New York State among the

Mohawks, 1642-91), a hundred years before Brainerd, was Joannes Megapolensis, but few ever heard of him, for he had no biographer. And still more obscure are the French Jesuit missionaries, who for the sake of their Holy Church exhibited a heroism which puts John Eliot and David Brainerd to the blush. The efforts of the latter seem child's play and dilettante in comparison. Of this book it will be sufficient to say that it is intelligently written, is based throughout upon Brainerd's journal, from which each of his biographers have drawn, and gives a good idea of his short but useful and spiritual life. Those who desire further information are referred by the reviewer, not by Mr. Page, who does not mention any other books, to Rev. Dr. J. M. Sherwood's edition of Rev. Dr. S. E. Dwight's edition of Jonathan Edwards' original Life of Brainerd, published by Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1884, 12mo, \$1.50.

*Talks with Ralph Waldo Emerson*, by Charles J. Woodbury. (New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 18mo, pp. 177.) Mr. Woodbury has written what is on the whole an excellent little book. His style is somewhat grandiloquent at times. He has a fondness for using out-of-the-way words, such as "absterior" (p. 129), "confecting people" (p. 131), "lemurs" (p. 174). But the enthusiastic regard for Emerson is pleasant to find. The book is primarily written for young men. It is dedicated "To the youth of the land who aspire." It embodies conversations held with Emerson between 1865 and 1870, when Mr. Woodbury was himself a young man. All that he gives us of Emerson's talk is precious. Some of the anecdotes about Emerson are very amusing, as, for instance, the college students' surprise at their honored guest eating such "dainties" as "ice cream and comfits," with an appetite they had supposed "characteristic only of undergraduates," and that in face of the fact that Emerson had in his published writings forbidden those same dainties, "except for those who dare not trust the entertainment of their own minds" (p. 167). The book gives a good idea of the impression Emerson made upon young and ardent natures. His gospel of independence stirred their pulses and gave a direction upward to their thoughts. Many of his criticisms upon his contemporaries were shrewd and all were kindly. And so we thank Mr. Woodbury for having been at the pains to copy them from the journal in which they were originally jotted down. But surely Mr. Woodbury goes too far in his hero-worship when he attributes sinlessness to Emerson, as when he says, "he was a pilgrim of the invisible, and both by heritage and growth without the capacity of sin" (p. 115). Alas! the best of us has that. But that Emerson was a pure and lofty soul, who exhaled the fragrance of a God-filled nature, we joyfully acknowledge.

*Isaac and Jacob: their Lives and Times*. (New York: Randolph, 12mo, pp. viii., 186.) We have here a late addition to the "Men of the Bible Series," by George Rantlinon. It is to be regretted that the author is not aware of much that other men have learned from the processes of that much-abused science, "Higher Criticism." The exuberance of the author's imagination, however, is remarkable, and for a literary setting out of the scenes of biblical story the book may be recommended. But of fact as over against fancy, one may get as much in smaller space without the aid of this volume from Genesis. It may be said that the book is intended for the ordinary reader, but that will not excuse such antiquated views as those here presented; for instance, that with re-

gard to the location of the land of Goshen (p. 168). Either the book itself is much older than its imprint, or the author is far behind the times.

*What of Samuel?* by James Morris Whiton, Ph.D., minister of Trinity Congregational Church in New York (London: James Clarke & Co.; imported by Thomas Whittaker, New York, p. 8vo, pp. vi., 80; paper, 40 cents) is the title of a little book which proposes to give an account of Samuel, the prophet, the founder of the Schools of the Prophets, and the king making politician. Of biographical material there is very little, but of glimpses into the working of his mind, as viewed by the author, there are many. The author's standpoint is at a great remove from the ordinary one in regard to inspiration, and he brings out clearly some of the moral difficulties in the way of an inspiration which would make God responsible for many things which shock the moral sense of men to-day. The explanation given of the incident of the witch of Endor is the only one which is reasonable and at the same time satisfactory, though scarcely new.

Students of antiquities connected with Egypt and Assyria have long known the series of books constituting the "Records of the Past." After an interval of several years since the cessation of the publication, a new series has been projected under the editorship of Professor A. H. Sayce. The title is *Records of the Past; being English Translations of the Ancient Monuments of Egypt and Western Asia*. (London: Bagster, vols. i.-ii. 12mo, pp. xii., 175; ix., 208.) A number of changes are to be noted in connection with the appearance of this new series, which, however, is not so "new" that it contains no documents known to the former volumes. A few have been retranslated, and one cannot but be struck by the changes which have been made in the text, due to very material advances in the more exact grammatical knowledge of the languages from which the translations were made. A great improvement is to be noted in that the introductory remarks concerning the various pieces are fuller and more detailed than previously. The notes are more numerous and give much more information and more of detail than formerly. In exterior appearance the two series are precisely alike, but the arrangement by which the odd volumes contain only Assyrian or Babylonian texts, while those with even numbers contain nothing but Egyptian, has been abandoned. As specimens we have examined one of the documents which is repeated in the new series, and have found it so changed that it scarcely seems to represent the same original. Another we have compared with a copy of the original made by the writer directly from the Berlin papyrus. In general the translation is correct, except that in many cases the vice of such translations is evident in the desire to give a readable rendering even where the original is too doubtful to allow of certainty, or where our present knowledge will not allow us to go beyond mere conjecture. Attention may be called to what is an undoubted error in vol. ii., p. 20, where "Edima" (Edom?) is the form given to a geographical name which properly begins with a Q. New translations of the creation stories, the new Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and specimens of Assyrian correspondence are among the recent material added in the present series. A remark of Mr. Pinches (ii., p. 181) may be quoted as applicable to all translations like these: "Though the sense of the whole is pretty clear, the translation will probably be still further improved as time goes on."

QUA

In "A Study," gives an Outline of national Bible St. Publishing C. manager of the C. Apostoli D. W. C. protest C. opening outlet for and part of cism re. Means, I. rush of establish England ritualism Christ I. ity?" b. review r. exander "The A. Research Andover tion and the auth. out igno dogmat.

The

In the tion," b. away cu inspirat the fact, sometim verbal d. tion and which h. trine of follow Lilley, is to be in which Christi ligion," though difficult his fait difficult faith to and the thought Hegel, doctrin world, of "In treating which F. G. C. chivalr ment.

"Th. Blake, after e.



## QUARTERLY AND MAGAZINE REVIEWS.

*The Andover Review*, Oct., 1891.

In "An Advance Step in Sunday-School Bible Study," Rev. Erastus Blakeslee, Spencer, Mass., gives an account of the relation between the new Outline Inductive Bible Studies and the old International Lessons, announces the formation of The Bible Study Union, with The Bible Study Publishing Company, Boston, Mass., as its business managers; and concludes with the second series of the Outline Inductive Bible Studies—"The Apostolic Church." "The Cherokee Outlet," by D. W. C. Duncan, Esq., Tahlequah, I. T., is a protest on moral and legal grounds against the opening up by the Government of the Cherokee outlet for white settlement. Then follows the second part, "Ecclesiasticism," of the article "Criticism versus Ecclesiasticism," by Rev. Stewart Means, New Haven, Conn. It shows how the inrush of new life by the fall of Napoleon and the establishment of peace caused in the Church of England a merely retrograde movement, ending in ritualism, "a kind of bastard Romanism." "Is Christ Himself the Sufficient Creed of Christianity?" by Professor Gulliver, Andover, Mass., is a review and commendatory exposition of Rev. Alexander McKenzie's "Christ Himself;" and in "The Authority of the Pulpit in a Time of Critical Research and Social Confusion," Professor Tucker, Andover, Mass., discusses with great circumspection and considerable pungency the question how the authority of the pulpit can be vindicated without ignoring present issues or meeting inquiry with dogmatism.

*The Theological Monthly*, London, Oct., 1891.

In the opening article, "The Question of Inspiration," by Robert Watts, D.D., the author clears away certain misconceptions of the idea of plenary inspiration, which sometimes lead to the denial of the fact on account of ignorance of its inner nature, sometimes to confounding verbal inspiration with verbal dictation, and sometimes to making inspiration and revelation one and the same thing; after which he demonstrates the bearing of the true doctrine of inspiration on the doctrine of grace. Then follow Part IV. of "Ecce Christianus," by J. P. Lilley, moving from the consideration of what it is to be a Christian to a consideration of the way in which men are to be persuaded to enter on the Christian life; Part IV. of "Philosophy and Religion," by Edward Naville, demonstrating that, though on account of a feeling of piety awe it is difficult to a Christian to subject the contents of his faith to the searching light of science, it is as difficult to the philosopher who is a stranger to faith to apply that light to the Christian dogma, and that from sheer prejudice, which, willing though he is to study any doctrine of Aristotle or Hegel, makes him utterly unwilling to examine a doctrine which has changed the face of the moral world, solely because it is Christian; and Part II. of "Inspired Hebrew Poetry," by James Neil, treating of that large portion of Hebrew poetry in which the verse is not used. The "Jonathan," by F. G. Cholmondeley, is a study of the germs of chivalry or chivalrous ideas found in the Old Testament.

*The Unitarian Review*, Oct. 1891.

"The Church Service," by Rev. James Vila Blake, Chicago, Ill., sets forth the principles which, after eight years of experience, have come to rule

in the service and ritual of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago. After "Emerson as a Poet," by Frank P. Stearns, follows "Influences Bearing upon Christian Thought in Japan," a commencement oration delivered in Cambridge by Nariaki Kozaki, from which it appears that the importation of the scientific spirit of European civilization drives away not only ghosts, imps, and demons, and also leads to confusion of ideas respecting duty, God, and hope; but, happily, it also appears that Christianity in its simplest and most effective form—Christianity not as a creed, but as a moral agent—finds the field quite ready for it. The "Henry Giles," by A. Judson Rich, is a character sketch, full of life and significance.

*The Old and New Testament Student*, Oct., 1891.

The second part of "The Modern Jew and his Synagogue," by Rev. Professor T. W. Davies, B.D., Haverfordwest Baptist College, South Wales, gives a description of the fasts and feasts of the month Tishri, such as the author saw them celebrated in London. "The Self Consciousness of Jesus in its Relation to the Messianic Hope," by Rev. Albert W. Hitchcock, Berlin, proposes to employ the same method as would be employed in the study of the self-consciousness of any other genius who from the common human activity rose into a historical mission, and gives in its present first part an exposition and criticism of the various theories, rationalistic and supranaturalistic, from which others have started. Under the title "The Bible in English Life and Letters," Rev. J. T. McClure, D.D., Lake Forest, Ill., will give in three papers a succinct survey of the effect which the Bible has had upon England and upon all life influenced by England, a topic often touched upon by English writers, but never before, as far as we know, made the subject of a comprehensive review. In "The End of the World" Rev. Benjamin Wisner Bacon, Oswego, N. Y., makes a sharp distinction between the Rabbinic and the Christian idea of the kingdom of God, and discards as purely figurative the Judaistic eschatological element from the New Testament representation of the consummation of all things. Then follow "The Gospel of John" (xv. 1-xvi. 33), by William R. Harper and George S. Goodspeed, and "An Exposition on Biblical Grounds of 1 Cor. xv. 24-28," by Rev. J. Dyck, Sodus, N. Y., both of expository and homiletic character; finally, notes and notices.

*The New Englander and Yale Review*, Oct., 1891.

"The so-called Labor Problem," by Albert Mathews, New York City, is a very sharp, but at many points hitting criticism of the present phase of the problem and its treatment. "An Untouched Field for Missionary Labor," by Linton Satterthwait, Trenton, N. J., has a similar tendency, but a different character. Critically, it is directed against a generation of voters which has been taught that in politics everything is fair; positively it demands the application of the commonest rules of morality to politics. "The two Specially Critical Periods in the Life of the Young," by A. S. Chesebrough, Saybrook, Conn., with respect to the laying of the foundations of moral and religious character, refer to the beginning and the close of child-life, the first period covering the first three or four years and the second the age of puberty. Articles IV. and VI. are reviews of John F. Genung's translation of the Book of Job by D. H. Chamberlain, New York City, and of Sir Edwin Arnold's "Light of the World," by Thomas

R. Bacon, Berkeley, Cal. In "Enthusiasm for the Ministry," George A. Gordon, Boston, Mass., shows whence the ministry of the Gospel can and should draw its enthusiasm and its inspirations; and in "Prayer in a Universe of Law," Edward S. Parsons, Greeley, Col., maintains against Herbert Spencer and others that the accomplishment of all results in the universe by forces perfectly under the rule of law is no evidence whatsoever that such results are not the response of the divine free will to the prayer of a needy man.

*The Expositor*, London, Oct., 1891.

"The Prophet Jeremiah," by Rev. Professor A. Duff, is a study of his development in thought and utterance. By "The Fourfold Revelation of God" Professors H. M. Gwatkin, Cambridge, means the revelation of God in nature, Scripture, history, and life. "On the Moral Character of Pseudonymous Books" (article II.), by Rev. Professor J. S. Candlish, Glasgow, discusses some of those pious frauds to which Jewish and Christian literature has been subjected, beginning with the Wisdom of Solomon. "The Pure Word in the Foul Plot," by Rev. Samuel Cox, is an exhortation to be "swift to hear and slow to speak," and an exposition of the psychological connection between this clause and the one which follows immediately, "slow to wrath." Then follow "Candidates for Discipleship," by Rev. Professor Marcus Dods, "Note on *hoyasua*," by Rev. J. Llewellyn Davies, and "Zechariah," by Rev. Professor W. G. Elmslie, all of which are of expository or homiletic character.

*The Newbery House Magazine*, Oct., 1891.

"The Church Congress," by Rev. Morris Fuller, treats of the origin, purpose, principles, etc., of church congresses. Then follow "Sermon Outlines," by the editor, contributions of fiction, and "Germs and Disease," by Arthur A. Lynch. "Some Typographical Survivals," by Isaac Taylor, gives a number of curious illustrations of that system of abbreviation which was practised by mediæval scribes, and of which many traces are still to be found in the printed books of our days. "Bell Inscriptions," by J. Cuthbert Hadden, has a mingled antiquarian and poetical interest which makes it very pleasant reading. The illustrations of the number are interesting, especially those in the article "Childhood in Art," by Theodore Child.

*The Cumberland Presbyterian Review* (Quarterly), Nashville, Tenn., Oct., 1891.

The opening article, "History of Infant Baptism," by Rev. Professor J. D. Kirkpatrick, Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., is, as the title shows, not so much a discussion of the doctrine of the Church as a view of its history. "The Vocation to the Ministry," by Rev. P. G. Rea, Marshall, Mo., is an exposition of the authority, importance, difficulties, and delights of the ministry. "Propitiation and not Expiation," by Rev. B. G. Mitchell, Oxford, Miss., is a discussion of the terms used in the New and Old Testament in connection with this doctrine, as "Substitution, Mediation, Atonement," by Rev. J. W. Wood, Mattoon, Ill., is a discrimination between terms, based upon the relation between the Edenic period and the Gospel dispensation. "The Home Library," by Rev. J. D. Gold, Columbia, Tenn., is a plea for the library as something as necessary to a home as car-

pets and furniture, and gives suitable points for its formation. "The Gospel Preached by the Apostle Paul," by Rev. M. L. Gordon, Andover, Mass., puts the question, whether the Christ "on whom we rest all our hopes" is the true historical Christ or something of a phantasma built up and changed by tradition. "Should the Trinity be in a Creed?" by Rev. John Miller, Princeton, N. J., first defines what a creed should be, and then goes on to answer the question. "Heresy Fifty Years Ago," by Rev. Robert Hood, Glasgow, Scotland, relates to the trial of Rev. James Morison in Glasgow. "Elements of Spiritual Power," by Rev. Professor D. S. Bodenhamer, Trinity University, Tehuacana, Texas, distinguishes between spiritual power and merely mental power, and analyzes the former as a combination of faith, moral courage, and knowledge of God's Word under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

*The Sunday Magazine*, Edinburgh, London, Dublin, Oct., 1891.

"The Legacy of Love," by the Lord Bishop of Ripon, is a homily, and a beautiful one, on the words "Woman, behold thy son" (John xix. 26). "Christ's Hospital and its Sons," by Rev. E. H. Pearce, gives a survey of Christ's Hospital, its history, archaeology, organization, etc., but not so much for the sake of that history, archaeology, etc., as on account of the lesson which the institution teaches as a part of human life. "Henry Martyn," by Rev. Henry Montagu Butler, is a sermon preached in Trinity Church, Cambridge, on the first and the last texts on which Henry Martyn preached as curate of that church. In "The Great Salt Lake City and its People," Mr. William C. Preston gives his impression of that place, its looks, its history, its meaning.

*Good Words*, London, Oct., 1891.

Beside its instalments of fiction by Mrs. Oliphant, M. B. Tweedie, and J. M. Barrie, the number includes "Ancient Mosaics," by Mrs. Lecky, a well-illustrated and very instructive piece; "Off the Beaten Track," an interesting blending of nature description and church history, with the *insula sacra* of Bede as its centre; "Painter and Preacher," by James Stalker, D.D.; "Cowper and his Localities," by Rev. Canon Benham, etc. The "Questions of the Christian Life," by the Lord Bishop of Winchester, are homilies on the words "Why sleep ye?" "But why dost thou judge thy brother?" "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?" and "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?"

*The Missionary Review*, New York, Nov. 1891.

The article "The Causes of the Disturbance in China," by J. T. Gracey, will be read at this moment with special interest, giving, as it does, much new information. As one of the principal causes of the disturbance it mentions the pensioned army. When the Taiping rebellion was finally put down, the Chinese Government found an army of about one million soldiers on its hands. In order to effect a peaceful dissolution of this army, it was pensioned; but though a generation has passed away since that time, the number of pensioned soldiers has not decreased; and these men, living in idleness at the expense of the public treasury, have generally taken up a roving life, and have become

the rally  
kinds of  
articles in  
Peoples,  
and no  
sula, Spa  
tion of  
Central A  
guages of  
the Wor  
Mission  
of Chris  
Hillsdale

CO

HARVEY  
Frontispie  
tion for  
Good Wor  
worth, wh  
in 1890,"  
fourteen  
Azhar, th  
the Khan  
es; the M  
of Cairo;  
Ismaïl Pa  
understan  
farewell t  
a poem, b  
VI., by G  
author—  
story; "C  
trations b  
railroad c  
through  
Dickens  
Hutton—  
the last e  
sion," a  
son," by  
from dri  
valuable  
contained  
distinguish  
Eliza Cal  
Tunners,  
M.D.; "C  
White, I  
of Africa  
McEnery  
Walter R  
Elizabeth  
Elizabeth  
the poe  
vagabond  
city; "G  
George D  
ian Cur  
Editor  
"Month  
1891).

THE C  
pian, I  
graved b  
Indian  
T. Cole  
Bought  
Wilbur  
zel," C  
ers," Br  
Florence  
lung and  
as; "W  
"The  
Folks V  
miek; "C  
raphy o  
E. W. K  
ed by S  
Song  
River C  
D. Rob  
Song fo  
Supply  
vester  
Russell  
ism,"  
ell, wh

the rallying points, leaders, and instigators of all kinds of popular discontent. Other interesting articles in the number are "Missions to the Iberian Peoples," by J. M. Challis, D.D., Santiago, Chili, and not only to the peoples of the Iberian peninsula, Spain and Portugal, but also to the population of the vast colonies formed in South and Central America by those two peoples; "The Languages of Nynsalind in Relation to the Spread of the Word of God," by W. A. Elmslie, Livingstonia Mission; "The Relation of Money to the Progress of Christ's Kingdom," by Rev. W. D. Sexton, Hillsdale, Mich., etc.

#### CONTENTS OF CURRENT PERIODICALS.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE for November has these contents: Frontispiece—"And she frankly Told her Passion"—illustration for "The Inn of the Good Woman"; "The Inn of the Good Woman," a Thanksgiving-day story, by Hezekiah Butterworth, with eight illustrations, including frontispiece; "Cairo in 1890," Part II., by Constance Fenimore Woolson, with fourteen illustrations; the ancient university of Cairo, El Azhar, the Splendid; scenes in an Egyptian apartment-house; the Khan of Kait Bey; a horse-race; the dancing-dervishes; the Mohammedan at his prayers; sights from the Citadel of Cairo; the palace of Gezireh; the character and career of Ismail Pasha; the present Khedive; difficulties in the way of understanding Oriental nations; the East the land of mystery; farewell to Cairo; "Call not Pain's Teaching Punishment," a poem, by Amélie Rives; "Peter Ibbetson," a novel, Part VI., by George du Maurier, with fourteen illustrations by the author—the conclusion of this remarkable and powerful story; "Dan Dunn's Outfit," by Julian Ralph, with ten illustrations by Frederic Remington—scenes and characters in a railroad camp in British Columbia; how a railroad is built through the wilderness; frontier types; "Letters of Charles Dickens to Wilkie Collins," Part III., edited by Laurence Hutton—familiar correspondence from 1862 to 1870, covering the last eight years of Dickens's life; "November—Impression," a poem, by William Dean Howells; "Stonewall Jackson," by Rev. Henry M. Field, D.D., with eleven illustrations from drawings by Charles Graham and F. V. DuMont—a valuable paper, based largely upon hitherto unpublished facts contained in Mrs. Jackson's forthcoming biography of her distinguished husband; "The Unspoken Word," a poem, by Eliza Calvert Hall; "The Treatment of Cancers and other Tumors," by B. Farquhar Curtis, M.D., and William T. Bull, M.D.; "Africa, and the European Powers," by Arthur Silva White, F.R.S.E., with map showing the comparative value of African lands; "The Widder Johnsing," a story, by Ruth McElroy Stuart; "The London of Queen Elizabeth," by Walter Besant, with ten illustrations—the London of Queen Elizabeth a city of ruins; the beginning of a new era; an Elizabethan house; the merchants; the grammar schools; the poets and dramatists; amusements; theatres; rogues, vagabonds, and cheats; cruel punishments; social life in the city; "Perils of Speculation," full-page illustration by George du Maurier; "Editor's Easy Chair," by George William Curtis; "Editor's Study," by William Dean Howells; "Editor's Drawer," conducted by Charles Dudley Warner; "Monthly Record of Current Events" (to September 14, 1891).

THE CENTURY for November has these contents: "Delpidan Sibyl" and "Cumaran Sibyl," by Michelangelo, engraved by T. Cole, frontispieces; "Michelangelo Buonarroti," Italian old Masters, W. J. Stillman, engravings and notes by T. Cole; "Isaak Walton," from a painting by George H. Boughton; "Southern Womanhood as Affected by the War," Wilbur Fisk Tillett; "A Great German Artist—Adolf Menzel," Carl Marr, pictures by Adolf Menzel; "The Players," Brander Matthews, pictures by A. Brennan; "India," Florence Earle Coates; "The Naulacka," L. I. Rydard, Rippling and Wolcott Balestier; "Sursun Corda," Edith M. Thomas; "What are Americans Doing in Art?" F. D. Millet; "The Hunger-Strike," Elizabeth W. Fiske; "How Old Folks Won the Oaks," J. J. Eakins, pictures by H. Helme; "Brontë," Harriet Prescott Spofford; "The Autobiography of a Justice of the Peace," Edgar W. Nye, pictures by E. W. Kemble; "Mazzini's Letters to an English Lady," edited by Stephen Prout, Joseph Mazzini; "In the Pines of her Song," Orelia Key Bell; "A Rival of the Yosemite," King's River Cañon, John Muir, pictures by the author and Charles D. Robinson; "A Theft Condoned," Gertrude Smith; "A Song for all Seasons," James Herbert Morse; "The Food-Supply of the Future," W. O. Atwater; "Folk-song," Sylvester Baxter; "The Sonnet," Edith Wharton; "James Russell Lowell," George E. Woodberry; "Lowell's Americanism," Joel Benton, with a letter from James Russell Lowell, with Portrait; "The Major's Appointment," Julia

Schayer, pictures by C. D. Gibson; "The Choice," Owen Jones; "Music," A. Lampman; "San Francisco Vigilance Committees," by the Chairman of the Committees 1851, 1856, and 1877, William T. Coleman; "Topics of the Time," "Lowell's Legacy to his Country," "Michigan's Wild-cat Banks," "Corrupt Practices Legislation in 1891," "An American Achievement in Art," "Open Letters," "California's Interest in Yosemite Reform," George G. Mackenzie; "A Roman Catholic's View of Sister Dolores," "L. I.," "The Paris Opera," A. Vianesi; "George H. Boughton," M. G. Van Rensselaer; "In Lighter Vein," "Kitty, My Colleen," P. J. Coleman; "The Prophets," C. P. Stetson; "Brer Fox," E. A. Oldham; "Grace after Meat," Margaret Vandegrift; "Ho for the Desert!" G. E. de Steigver; "My Old Skippers," C. H. Webb; "The New Street-Sweeper," G. Townner.

SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE for November has these contents: "Evening Colors," frontispiece, the United States Naval Apprentice System, drawn by R. F. Zogbaum, engraved by R. Varley; "Explorations in the Sierra Madre," by Carl Lumholtz, illustrations by Herbert Denman, E. E. Thompson, W. L. Metcalf, C. Broughton, J. Reich, and E. W. Deming; engraving by Varley, C. I. Butler, and Van Ness; "The Federation of Australia," by the Hon. Alfred Deakin, M.P. of Victoria, one of the Delegates to the National Australasian Convention; "In November," by Duncan Campbell Scott; "The United States Naval Apprentice System," by A. B. Wyckoff, Lieutenant U. S. Navy, illustrations by R. F. Zogbaum; engraving by Pettit, Witte, and M. J. Whaley; "The Wrecker"—Chapters X.-XL., by Robert Louis Stevenson and Lloyd Osbourne (begun in August, to be continued, with a full-page illustration by William Hole; "The Ocean Steamship as a Freight Carrier," by John H. Gould, the sixth article in the series on Ocean Steamships, illustrations by O. H. Bacher, M. J. Burns, C. Broughton, and V. Pénard; engraving by Andrew; "A Recognition," by Octave Thanet; "Dolores," by William Vaughn Moody; "The Picturesque Quality of Holland," figures and costumes, by George Hitchcock, illustrations by George Hitchcock, engraving by John P. Davis, Pettit, Witte, and J. F. Juenling; "The Proposed Trans-Saharan Railway," by Napoleon Xy, illustrations by J. H. Twachtman, V. Gribayedoff, and W. C. Filder; engraving by Pettit and M. J. Whaley; "Song from Ayuna," by Julian Hawthorne; "Mr. Lowell as a Teacher," "The Auction," "Adventures among Books," second paper, by Andrew Lang; "The Point of View," Mr. Lowell in Anti-slavery Days; "The Safety of Buildings; Vapor that Vanishes; Unimproved Chances of Self-assertion."

LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE for November has these contents: "The Duke and the Commoner," by Mrs. Poultney Bigelow; "On the State of the Tide," by F. Arnold; "The Tetrix," by Clinton Scollard; "Some Colonial Love-letters," by Anne H. Wharton; "Two Songs," by Harrison S. Morris; "The Return of the Rejected," by Octave Thanet; "Association Football," by Frederick Wier; "Shadow and Substance," by Barton Hill; "Sorrow," by Henry Peterson; "The Evolution of Money and Finance," by J. Howard Cowperthwaite; "The Restoration of Silver," by John A. Grier; "An Interviewer Interviewed—a Talk with George Alfred Townsend;" "Modern American Humor," by William S. Walsh; "With the Wits," (illustrated by leading artists.)

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE. The numbers of *The Living Age* for October 10th and 17th contain "The System of the Stars," *Edinburgh Review*; "The Story of a Violin," *Macmillan's Magazine*; "Archibald Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury," *Blackwood's Magazine*; "Some Famous Pirates," *National Review*; "Life in an Algerian Hill-Town," *Gentleman's Magazine*; "A Noble Mother," *Leisure Hour*; "Rousseau's Ideal Household," *National Review*; "Tennyson's Lincolnshire Farmers; A Retrospect," *Westminster Review*; "Note on a New Poet," *Fortnightly Review*; "Mrs. Carlyle's Town," *Spectator*; "St. Paul and the Roman Law," *Contemporary Review*; "Heera Nand," *Macmillan's Magazine*; "Irish Bulls, and Bulls not Irish," *Temple Bar*; "Laurence Oliphant," *Scottish Review*; "A Remembrance," *New Review*; "On the Relation of Painter's Palace of Pleasure to the English Romantic Drama," *Fortnightly Review*; "High Life," *Cornhill Magazine*; "Flowers and the Poets," *Gentleman's Magazine*; "Rebecca and her Daughters," *Leisure Hour*; "Persia under the Present Shah," *Asiatic Quarterly Review*; "The Bridge of the Hundred Spans," *Good Words*; together with poetry and miscellany.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for November has these contents: "The Lady of Fort St. John," XVI.-XVIII., and Postlude, Mary Hartwell Catherwood; "Count Tulevsky at Home," Isabel F. Haywood; "A November Prairie," Katharine T. Prescott; "The Chief City of the Province of the Gods," Lafcadio Hearn; "A Trumpet Call," E. Cavazza; "E-lim-in-ah-do," Clinton Scollard; "James Clarence Mangin," Louise Imogen Guiney; "The Chaperon," in two parts, part first, Henry James; "The Schools at Oxford," S. E. Winbolt; "Beyond the Day," John Vance Cheney; "A People without Law," L. James Bradley Thayer; "Journalism and Literature," W. J. Stillman; "Two French Men of Letters," "The Gods in Greece," "Comment on New Books," "The Contributors' Club."

## CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

## THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, October, 1891.

- An Advance Step in Sunday-School Bible Study. Rev. E. BLAKESLEE.  
 The Cherokee Outlet. D. W. C. DUNCAN, Esq.  
 Criticism *versus* Ecclesiasticism. H. Ecclesiasticism. Rev. STEWART MEANS.  
 Is Christ Himself the Sufficient Creed of Christianity? Prof. GULLIVER.  
 The Authority of the Pulpit in a Time of Critical Research and Social Confusion. Prof. TUCKER.

## THE UNITARIAN REVIEW.

Boston and London, October, 1891.

- The Church Service. JAMES VILA BLAKE.  
 Emerson as a Poet. FRANK P. STEARNS.  
 Influences bearing upon Christian Thought in Japan. NABIAKI KOZAKI.  
 Henry Giles. A. JUDSON RICH.  
 Unitarianism as History. THE EDITOR.

## THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT.

Hartford, Conn., October, 1891.

- The Modern Jew and his Synagogue. II. Rev. Prof. T. W. DAVIES, B.D.  
 The Self-Consciousness of Jesus in its Relation to the Messianic Hope. I. Rev. ALBERT W. HITCHCOCK.  
 The Bible in English Life and Letters. I. Rev. J. T. McCLEURE, D.D.  
 The End of the World. Rev. BENJAMIN WISNER BACON.  
 The Gospel of John. WILLIAM K. HARPER and GEORGE S. GOODFRED.  
 An Exposition on Biblical Grounds of 1 Cor. xv. 24-28. Rev. J. DYCK.

## THE THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

London, October, 1891.

- The Question of Inspiration. R. WATTS, D.D.  
 Ecce Christianus. IV. J. P. LILLEY.  
 Philosophy and Religion. IV. EDWARD NAVILLE.  
 Inspired Hebrew Poetry. II. J. NEIL.  
 Jonathan. F. G. CHILMONDELEY.

## NEW ENGLANDER AND YALE REVIEW.

- The so-called Labor Problem. ALBERT MATHEWS.  
 An Untouched Field for Missionary Labor. LINTON SATTERTHWAITE.  
 The Two Specially Critical Periods in the Life of the Young. A. S. CHESEBROUGH.  
 Gering's Job, or "The Epic of the Inner Life." D. H. CHAMBERLAIN.  
 Enthusiasm for the Ministry. GEO. A. GORDON.  
 Sir Edwin Arnold's "Light of the World." THOMAS R. BACON.  
 Prayer in a Universe of Law. EDWARD S. PARSONS.

## THE MISSIONARY HERALD.

Boston, October, 1891.

- Sketch of Marsovan Station, Western Turkey. Rev. GEORGE F. HERRICK, D.D.  
 The Disturbances in China. The New Encyclopedia of Missions.  
 Russia and Gospel Work in the Caucasus. Rev. WILLIAM N. CHAMBERS.  
 Education at Harpoot, Eastern Turkey. Rev. H. N. BARNUM.

## THE EXPOSITOR.

London, October, 1891.

- The Prophet Jeremiah. Rev. Prof. A. DUFF, M.A., LL.D.  
 The Fourfold Revelation of God. Prof. H. M. GWATKIN, M.A.

The Moral Character of Pseudonymous Books.

- Rev. Prof. J. S. CANDLISH, D.D.  
 The Pure Word in the Foul Plot. Rev. SAMUEL COX, D.D.  
 Candidates for Discipleship. Rev. PROF. MARCUS DODS, D.D.  
 Note on λογισμοί, in 2 Cor. x. Rev. J. LLEWELYN DAVIES.  
 Zechariah. Rev. Prof. W. G. ELSLIE, D.D.

## THE NEWBURY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London, October, 1891.

- The Church Congress. Rev. MORRIS FULLER, B.D.  
 Are High Churchmen Disloyal? H. ORMONDE.  
 "No Compromise" (chaps. x-xiii). By HELEN F. HETHERINGTON and Rev. H. DARWIN BURTON, A.M.  
 The Rocks of Tregarthen. ELEANOR TOWLE.  
 Germs and Disease. ARTHUR A. LYNCH.  
 Childhood in Art. THEODORE CHILD.  
 Some Typographical Survivals. Canon ISAAC TAYLOR.  
 Bell Inscriptions. J. CUTHBERT HADDEN.  
 The Song of the Axe. FREDERIC E. WEATHERLY.  
 The Birthplace of England's Earliest Bard. Rev. J. W. SOUTHERN, M.A.

## OUR DAY.

Boston, October, 1891.

- May the United States Intercede for the Jews? Rev. W. E. BLACKSTONE.  
 Crimes against Working Girls. Rev. L. ALBERT BANKS.  
 Sunday Closing of the World's Fair. Rev. W. F. CRAFTS.  
 Seen from Beyond. Pres. J. E. RANKIN, D.D.  
 Boston Monday Lectures—16th year.—Modern Science and the Resurrection.—Can Apparitions be Photographed? JOSEPH COOK.

## CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

- Quarterly, Nashville, Tenn., October, 1891.  
 History of Infant Baptism. Rev. Prof. J. D. KIRKPATRICK, D.D.  
 The Vocation to the Ministry. Rev. P. G. REA.  
 Propitiation and not Expiation. Rev. B. G. MITCHELL.  
 The Home Library. Rev. J. D. GOLD.  
 Substitution, Mediation, Atonement. Rev. J. W. WOOD.  
 Co-Education. Prof. L. A. JOHNSON.  
 The Gospel, Preached by the Apostle Paul. Rev. M. L. GORDON, D.D.  
 The Invincible Book. Rev. J. H. PIPER.  
 Woman's Past and Future. Prof. J. I. D. HINDS, Ph.D.  
 Should the Trinity be in a Creed? Rev. JOHN MILLER.  
 Character Determines Destiny. Rev. T. A. COWAN.  
 Elements of Spiritual Powers. Rev. Prof. D. S. BODENHAMER.

## THE SUNDAY MAGAZINE.

London, October, 1891.

- Godiva Durlough (chaps. xxiv-xxv). SARAH DODDNEY.  
 The Legacy of Love. The Lord Bishop of Ripon (W. B. CARPENTER, D.D.).  
 Christ's Hospital and its Sons. Rev. E. H. PEARCE, M.A.  
 A Strange Service. Mrs. CHARLES GARNETT.  
 While-You-Wait. THE RIVERSIDE VISITOR.  
 A Night in a Yeshidi Village. MICHAEL A. MORRISON.  
 The People and the People's Palace. Rev. A. R. BUCKLAND, M.A.

On Lonely Hills (Conclusion).

- MARY DAVISON.  
 Henry Martyn. Rev. DR. BUTLER.  
 The Great Salt Lake City. WILLIAM C. PRESTON.  
 A High-born Roman Lady (Conclusion). E. W. CARTER.  
 The Comforter. MARY HARRISON.  
 Sunday Evenings with the Children. Mrs. G. C. REANEY.

Poetry.

## GOOD WORDS.

London, October, 1891.

- The Marriage of Elinor (chaps. xxxvii-xl.). Mrs. OLIPHANT.  
 Ancient Mosaics. Mrs. LECKY.  
 Danger's Troubled Night (Conclusion). The Author of "Bretha."  
 Off the Beaten Track. CHARLES BLATHERWICK.  
 Painter and Preacher. JAMES STALKER, D.D.  
 Cowper and his Localities. Rev. Canon BENHAM, B.D.  
 Some Illustrations of English Thrift. Rev. Canon BLACKLEY, M.A.  
 Forest Trees in Suburban Gardens. CHARLES W. CHAPMAN, M.D.  
 The Wisdom of Don Quixote. FLORENCE MACCANS.  
 A House-Surgeon's Story. M. B. TWEEDIE.  
 The Little Minister (chaps. xxxviii-xxviii.). The Author of "Bretha."  
 Questions of the Christian Life. The Lord Bishop of Winchester (A. W. THOROLD, D.D.).

## THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD.

New York, November, 1891.

- Our Debt, our Duty, and our Destiny. Rev. A. T. PIERSON, D.D.  
 The Relation of Money to the Progress of Christ's Kingdom. Rev. W. D. SEXTON.  
 The Languages of Nyassa-Land (British Central Africa) in Relation to the Spread of the Word of God. W. A. ELSLIE.  
 A Missionary Prayer. Rev. J. F. B. TISLING.  
 Rev. L. H. GULICK, D.D.  
 Foreign Missions from the Standpoint of Art. Rev. W. B. GREEN, D.D.  
 The Carey Epoch in Missions. Rev. D. L. LEONARD.  
 The Melanesian Mission. Rev. ROBERT STEEL, D.D.  
 Congregationalists and Missions. Rev. EDWARD STORROW.  
 A New Application of an Old Hymn. PAUL V. BOWMAR.  
 Nam Thang Song. Rev. F. ELLIS.  
 Cuba as a Mission Field. W. J. MORMAN.  
 The Protestant Movement in Mexico. ELEANOR P. ALLEN.  
 Extracts and Translations from Foreign Periodicals. Rev. C. C. STARBUCK.  
 International Department. Edited by Rev. J. T. GRACEY, D.D.

## THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

Richmond, Va., October, 1891.

- Calvinism and Confessional Revision. A. KUYPER, D.D.  
 The Universal Book. J. B. SHEARER, D.D., LL.D.  
 Inspiration of the Scriptures. JOHN PYM CARTER, D.D.  
 The Study of the Bible in the Original Languages. W. M. MCPHETERS, D.D.  
 Calvinism; and Calvinism and Infant Salvation. W. L. NOURSE, D.D.  
 Notes: Some Alleged Discrepancies between the Books of Chronicles and Kings. LEWIS B. PATON.  
 Closed Questions. ROBT. A. WEBB, D.D.  
 The Christian Endeavor Movement. JAMES LEWIS HOWE, Ph.D.  
 Critics and Reviews.



## METHODIST REVIEW.

New York, November-December, 1891.  
The Genesis of the New Testament, with a few Words respecting Higher Criticism. Prof. L. T. TOWNSEND, S.T.D.  
Recent Missionary Discussions. Bishop J. M. THORBURN, D.D.  
Pantheism and Cognition. Prof. C. M. MOSS, Ph.D.

Pre-Adamites. Rev. HENRY COLMAN, S.T.D.  
Promonads. Rev. HENRY GRAHAM, D.D.  
Mental and Moral Characteristics of Martin Luther. Rev. W. N. McLEROY, D.D.  
Regeneration as a Force in Reform Movements. Rev. C. M. MORSE.  
Editorial Notes and Discussions.

## THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW.

Philadelphia, Pa., October, 1891.  
Eternal Retribution. SAMUEL H. KELLOGG.  
Simon Peter in the School of Christ. GEORGE T. PURVES.  
Hypothesis and Dogma in the Sciences. CHARLES W. SHIELDS.  
The "New Psychology." D. W. FISHER.  
The Prophecies of Balaam. LEWIS B. PATON.

The Vocabulary of the New Testament. J. KITCHE SMITH.  
The International Missionary Union. JOHN L. NEVINS.  
The General Synod of the Presbyterian Church in America. TALBOT W. CHAMBERS.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. WILLIAM CAVEN.

## THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

New York, November, 1891.  
Eugène Bersier. Rev. Prof. WM. C. WILKINSON, D.D.

The Ministry and Popular Education. Bishop JOHN H. VINCENT, D.D.  
Serial Preaching. Rev. Prof. J. O. MURRAY, D.D.

How Can Economic Studies Help the Ministry? Rev. Pres. E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS, D.D., LL.D.

Some Thoughts on Liturgies. Prof. F. V. N. PAINTER.

## THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Philadelphia, Pa., October, 1891.

The Relation of Humanity to Divinity. Pres. J. S. STAHR, Ph.D., D.D.  
The Renaissance and the Reformation. Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

A Retrospect—1791-1891. JOHN BLAIR LINN, Esq.

The Liturgical Movement in the Scottish Kirk. Rev. WM. FREDERICK FABER.  
Divine Revelation. Rev. S. Z. BEAM, D.D.

The Atonement Viewed from the Person of Christ. Rev. HIRAM KING, D.D.

Simon Bar-Jona: The Stone and the Rock. Mrs. T. C. PORTER.

## CHRISTIAN THOUGHT.

Bi-monthly, New York, October, 1891.

The Scientific and Social Law of Survival. Rev. WILLIAM W. McLANE, D.D., Ph.D.  
(Remarks on Dr. McLane's paper, by Prof. G. Macloskie.)  
The Children of Adam. S. D. MCCONNELL, D.D.

The Origin and Power of Religious Ideas. Prof. M. J. CRAWER, A.M., D.D.

## THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

Gettysburg, Pa., 1891.  
The Sacred Scriptures. Rev. Prof. GEO. H. SCHODDE, Ph.D.

The Bible the World-Book.

Rev. Prof. S. S. RAHN.  
The General Question. Rev. J. M. CROWER.

Catechisation and Confirmation in the Lutheran Church. Rev. P. BERGSTRASSER, D.D.

The Joys of the Ministry. Rev. DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D.D.

The Divine Formula for the Administration of the Lord's Supper. Rev. GEORGE H. COX.

Status and Treatment of the Non-commun-  
ing adult Member. Rev. CHARLES C. HAY.

The Christian College. Rev. F. D. ALTMAN.

The Evangelical Element in Catechisation. Rev. ADAM STUMP.

Our Debts—"our Trespasses." Rev. Prof. E. J. WOLF, D.D.

## SUNDAY AT HOME.

London, October, 1891.

Marjorie's Trial (continued Story). STANLEY J. WEYMAN.

Mrs. Timorous. LESLIE KEITH.  
Thomas Valpy French, D.D., First Bishop of Lahore.

The Adoration of Buddha's Tooth (continued). CONSTANCE F. GORDON-CUMMING.

Jews in London. Mrs. BREWER.  
Heroes of the Goodwin Sands. Rev. T. STANLEY TREANOR.

The Fixed Heart. Lady GRISSELL BAILLIE.

Religious Life and Thought in Spain. Westminster Abbey. Miss BRADLEY.

How Conviction was Wrought in Simon Peter. Rev. J. T. L. MAGGS.  
Sir Edward Baines. Rev. EUSTACE R. CONDER, LL.D.

## MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Achelis, E. Chr., Prof., Dr. Praktische Theologie, 2. Band, Liturgik. Die Lehre vom Gemeindegottesdienst. Die Lehre von den freien Verträgen. Kybernetik. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1891. Pp. xx, 540, 8vo, 11 mk.

Assyriologische Bibliothek, herausgegeben von Frdr. Delitzsch und Paul Haupt. 3. Band. 2. Abtheilung. 1. Lieferung. Inhalt: Das babylonische Nimrod-epos. Keilschrifttext der Bruchstücke der sogenannten Izdubar-legenden mit dem keilschriftlichen Stütflutberichte. Nach den Originalen im britischen Museum copirt und herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Paul Haupt. 2. Abtheilung. Der Keilschrifttext der XI. und XII. Tafeln wie der seit 1882 neugefundenen oder vervollständigten Fragmente ertheilt. 1. Lieferung. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1891. Pp. 79-150, Nr. 43-72. (I., 1-4; II., III., 1, 2, 1; IV.-VI. und X., 332 mk.)

Baron, David. Rays of Messiah's Glory: or, Christ in the Old Testament. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 254, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Barrows, John H. The Gospels are True Histories. Boston: Lothrop, 1891. Pp. 146, 12mo, 75 cts.

Bender, H. Ueber das Wesen der Sittlichkeit und den natürlichen Entwicklungsprozess des sittlichen Gedankens. Kritische Studie. Halle a. S.: Pfeffer, 1891. Pp. vii., 127, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Berdoo, E. Browning's Message to his Time: His Religion, Philosophy and Science. 2d ed. London: Sonnenschein, 1891. Pp. 178, 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Bergemann, P. Ernst Platner als Moralphilosoph und sein Verhältnis zur Kant'schen Ethik. Halle a. S.: Pfeffer, 1891. Pp. 56, 8vo, 1 mk.

Bernhardt, Wilhelm, Prof., Dr. Die Bannbulle Leo X. gegen Luther, nach dem Original-Text der im Lutherhause zu Wittenberg Ausgabe vom 17. Juli, 1520. Nebst der deutschen Übersetzung. Wittenberg: Senf, 1891. Pp. 68, 16mo, 1 mk.

Besolow, Thomas E. From the Darkness of Africa to the Light of America. The story of an African Prince. New York: McLean, 1891. Pp. 160, 12mo, 50 cts.

Bewsher, M. E., Mrs. Mischief-Makers; or, The Story of Zipporah. A tale of the times of Herod the Great. London: Griffith, 1891. Pp. 384, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Bible. Libri Josue et Judicum Textum masoreticum accuratissime expressit, e fontibus Masorae varie illustravit, notis criticis confirmavit S. Baer. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1891. Pp. vi., 130, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Boardman, George Dana. The Problem of Jesus. Philadelphia: Huber, 1891. Pp. 35, 12mo, 25 cts.

Boedder, B. Natural Theology. London: 1891. Pp. 490, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Bolin, W. Ludwig Feuerbach, sein Wirken und seine Zeitgenossen. Mit Benutzung ungedruckten Materials dargestellt. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1891. Pp. x., 353, 8vo, 6 mk.

Boass, F. Der präexistente Christus des Justinus Martyr, eine Episode aus der Geschichte des christologischen Dogmas. Dissertation. Greifswald, 1891. Pp. iv., 16, 8vo.

Brockett, L. P., M.D. The Story of the Karen Mission in Bassein, 1830-1890; or, The Progress and Education of a People from a Degraded Heathenism to a Refined Christian Civilization. Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. xx., 160, 12mo, cloth, 90 c.

Bruesselbach, J. Das helle Licht der Wahrheit oder die wissenschaftliche Weltanschauung, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religionsvorstellungen dargestellt. Leipzig: Richter, 1891. Pp. xii., 77, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Buchwald, R. De liturgia gallicana. Dissertation. Vratislaviae, 1890. Pp. 44, 8vo.

Burckhardt, J. The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy. Cheap edition. London: Sonnenschein, 1891. Pp. 570, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Campe, W.<sup>1</sup> Das Verhältniss Jeremias zu den Psalmen. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Alter der Psalmen. Inaugural-Dissertation. Halle a. S.: 1891. Pp. 38, 8vo.

**Chandler, A.** *The Spirit of Man. An essay in Christian Philosophy.* London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 228, p. 8vo, 5s.

**Christinnecke, Johs.** *Causalität und Entwicklung in der Metaphysik Augustins.* 1. Theil. Jena (Leipzig: Fock), 1891. Pp. 60, 8vo, 1 mk.

**Culross, James, D.D.** *Carey, the Pioneer Missionary.* Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. 214, 16mo, cloth, 50 cts.

**Cunningham, W., D.D.** *The Use and Abuse of Money.* New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. xxiv., 219, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

**Cutler, H. G.** *The World's Fair: its Meaning and Scope, its Old World Friends, their Countries, Customs and Religions; what they will Exhibit.* Chicago: Star Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. 610, 8vo, cloth, \$5.00.

**Davis, J. A., Rev.** *Upton. Its Church, pastor, people, and saloons, and what they did.* New York: Ref. Ch. Bd. Pub., 1891. Pp. vi., 426, 12mo, \$1.25.

**Dieckhoff, Aug. Wilhelm, Prof., D.D.** *Die Inspiration und Irrthumslosigkeit der heiligen Schrift.* Leipzig: Neumann, 1891. Pp. iii., 110, 8vo, 2 mk.

**Dods, Marcus, D.D.** *The Gospel of St. John. Vol. I. (Expositor's Bible.)* New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. xi., 388, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

**Driver, S. R., D.D.** *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.* New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. xxix., 222, 8vo, cloth, \$2.50 net. (The International Theological Library, edited by Charles A. Briggs, D.D., and Stewart D. F. Salmond, D.D. No. 1.)

**Earle, Alice Morse.** *The Sabbath in Puritan New England.* New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. viii., 335, 12mo, \$1.25.

**Eaton, Arthur Wentworth, B. A.** *The Church of England in Nova Scotia, and the Tory Clergy of the Revolution.* New York: Whitaker, 1891. Pp. xiv., 330, 12mo, \$1.50.

**Edwards, Tryon, D.D.** *A Dictionary of Thoughts. Being a cyclopedia of laconic quotations from the best authors, both ancient and modern. Alphabetically arranged by subjects.* New York: Cassell, 1891. Pp. xii., 644, 8vo, \$5.00.

**Epstein, Abraham.** *Rabbi Simeon Karo und der Ialkut Simeoni. Ein Essay.* Krakau (Wien: Lippe), 1891. Pp. 22, 8vo, 75 pf.

**Expositor's Bible.** Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D. *The Acts of the Apostles.* by G. T. Stokes, D.D. New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. xxiii., 424, 8vo, \$1.50.

**Eye, A. von.** *Die neue Weltanschauung.* 1. Heft. *Verwirklichung der frohen Botschaft.* Leipzig: Spohr, 1891. Pp. 32, 8vo, 60 pf.

**Feiler, Willy.** *Die Moral des Albertus Magnus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Ethik des Mittelalters.* Inaugural-Dissertation. Leipzig: 1891. Pp. 84, 8vo.

**Fradenburgh, J. N., D.D.** *Departed Gods: the Gods of our Fathers.* Cincinnati: Cranston, 1891. Pp. ii., 464, 12mo, cloth, \$1.20.

**From the Heart of England.** *A story of the dawn of modern missions: by the author of "Old Bristol."* Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. 416, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

**Grau, R. Fr., Prof.** *Luther's Katechismus, erklärt aus biblischer Theologie. Eine kurze Glaubenslehre. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. viii., 112, 8vo, 1.40 mk.*

**Grössel, W.** *Justinianus von Weltz, der Vorkämpfer der lutherischen Mission. (Faber's Missionsbibliothek, Nr. 2 und 3.)* Leipzig: Faber, 1891. Pp. iv., 191, 8vo, 2 mk.

**Grundemann, R., Dr.** *Hanukb Dato, der braune Pastor. Eine Lebensgeschichte aus der Kolmission. (Dorpen und Achren vom Missionsfelde. Heft 4.)* Berlin: Müller, 1891. 10 pf.

**Grundl, Beda.** *De Interpolationibus ex Sancti Justinii philosophi et martyris Apologia secunda expungendis. Dissertatio inauguralis.* Augustae Vindelicorum, 1891. Pp. 76, 8vo.

**Grundriss der theologischen Wissenschaften,** bearbeitet von Achelis, Cornill Ficker und Anderen. 2. Theil. 1. Band. *Einführung in das Alte Testament.* von Prof. Dr. Carl Heinrich Cornill. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1891. Pp. xii., 325, 8vo, 5 mk.

**Hand-Commentar zum neuen Testament,** bearbeitet von H. J. Holtzmann, R. A. Lipsius, P. W. Schmiedel, H. von Soden. 3. Band. 1. Abtheilung. *Die Briefe an die Kolosser, Epheser, Philemon. Die Pastoralbriefe.* Bearbeiter von H. von Soden. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1891. Pp. iii., vii., 355, 8vo, \$4.50.

**Haupt, O.** *Luther und Rabelais in ihren pädagogischen Beziehungen. Inaugural-Dissertation.* Leipzig, 1890. Pp. 48.

**Hedge, Frederic Henry.** *Sermons.* Boston: Roberts, 1891. Pp. v., 341, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

**Heilmann, Lee M., Rev.** *Christian Nurture in the Lutheran Church and Home. The scriptural law of education from infancy to complete life.* New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 224, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

**Hillel, F., Dr.** *Die Nominalbildungen in der Mischnah.* Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1891. Pp. 52, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

**Hofmeyer, N. J.** *The Blessed Life: How to Find it and Live it.* Author's edition. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. 251, 12mo, \$1.00.

**Hughey, G. W., D.D.** *Baptismal Remission; or, The Design of Christian Baptism.* Cincinnati: Cranston, 1891. Pp. ii., 134, 12mo, cloth, 60 cts.

**Hulst, M. d'.** *Christianisme et Occultisme.* Paris: Sirey, 1891. Pp. 27, 8vo.

**Hunt, A. N., Rev.** *Sermons for the Christian Year. Vol. I. Advent to Whit-Sunday. Vol. II. Trinity to Advent.* London: Skeffington, 1891. P. 8vo, each, 5s.

**Iken, J. Friedrich.** *Die bremische Kirchenordnung von 1534. Herausgegeben von der historischen Gesellschaft des Künstlervereins.* Bremen: Müller, 1891. Pp. lxxxiii., 126, 8vo, 3 mk.

**Inheritance of the Saints; or, Thoughts on the Communion of Saints and the Life of the World to Come.** Collected chiefly from English writers by L. P., with a preface by H. S. Holland. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 372, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

**International Congregational Council,** London, 1891. *Authorized Record of Proceedings.* With introduction by R. W. Dale. London: Clarke, 1891. Pp. 450, 8vo, 5s.

**Jacob, B.** *Das Buch Esther bei den LXX. Inaugural-Dissertation.* Gießen, 1891. Pp. 64, 8vo.

**Jacquier, E.** *La doctrine des douze Apôtres et ses enseignements.* Thèse. Paris: Lethiellieux, 1891. Pp. 279, 8vo.

**Jenkins, R. C.** *Pre-Tridentine Doctrine. A review of the commentary on the Scriptures of Thomas de Vio, commonly called the Cardinal Cajetan.* London: Nutt, 1891. 8vo, 5s.

**Johnson, E. H., D.D.** *Outline of Systematic Theology.* Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. 304, 8vo, cloth, \$2.00.

**Jones, W. H.** *On the Way Home. Sixty short sermons for life's travelers.* London: Skeffington, 1891. Pp. 210, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

**Juncker, A.** *Das Ich und die Motivation des Willens im Christenthum. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung des endemischen Problems.* Inaugural-Dissertation. Halle a. S.: 1891. Pp. ii., 75.

**Kneer, A.** *Kardinal Zabarella (Franciscus de Zabarellis, Cardinalis Florentinus), 1360-1417. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des grossen abendländischen Schismas. Theil I. Dissertation.* Münster, 1891. Pp. viii., 68, 8vo.

**Kohut, Alexander, Rabbl.** *Dr. Aruch Completum, sive Lexicon Vocabula et res, quae in libro Targumicis, Talmudicis, et Midraschicis continentur, explicans Nathane filio Jehielis, etc.* Wien: Lippe, 1891. Pp. 401-408 und 316, 8vo, 15 mk. (In hebräischer Sprache.)

**La Broise, R. de.** *Bossuet et la Bible, étude d'après les documents originaux.* Paris: Retaux-Bray, 1891. Pp. iii., 453, 8vo.

**Lasteyrie, R. de.** *L'Eglise Saint-Martin de Tours.*

Étude Critique  
ve au xie siècle

Löhr, Mo  
Göttingen:

Loewy,  
Grundlagen  
8vo, 2 80 mk

Lots, Wi  
in Alten Te  
8vo, 6 80 mk

McCann  
don: Nisbet

McConn  
New York:

MacDuff  
16mo, cloth

MacLan  
mois, Lon

McNeil  
and Chicag

March,  
Boston: C  
cloth, \$2.00

Martin  
lected and  
Philosophy  
Longmans,

Meyer  
Faith, N  
cloth, \$1.00  
same, P  
with God  
Joseph: J  
cloth, \$1.00

Mitch  
now Chri  
biography  
135, 12mo

Mols  
gestaltun  
Fock, 189

Moore  
Address  
chiefly L  
taker, 18

Mose  
geen d  
1890. 1

Mur  
Boston

Nati  
Tenth I  
Springs  
present  
ed, roll  
Pp. ii.,

Naw  
Courtes

Net  
Eine U  
Rabba  
1891.

Ne  
Sermon  
from  
With  
Ref. C

Pa  
Amer  
Pp. 1

Pa  
Kjob

Pi  
Vol.

Étude Critique sur l'histoire et la forme de ce monument du ve au xie siècle. Paris: Klincksieck, 1891. Pp. 56, 4to.

Löhr, Max, Dr. Die Klagelieder des Jeremias erklärt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1891. Pp. 101, Lex. 8vo, 3 mk.

Loewy, Theodor, Dr. Der Idealismus Berkeley's in den Grundlagen untersucht. Wien: Tempsky, 1891. Pp. 142, 8vo, 2 80 mk.

Lotz, Wilhelm, Prof., Dr. Geschichte und Offenbarung im Alten Testament. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891. Pp. ix., 353, 8vo, 6 80 mk.

McCann, J. The Moral Culture of the Christian. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 128, 12mo, 18.

McConnell, S. D., Rev., D.D. Sons of God. Sermons. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. v., 291, 8vo, \$1.50.

MacDuff, J. R., D.D. Hospices of the Pilgrim. The great word of Christ. New York: Nelson, 1891. Pp. 192, 16mo, cloth, \$1.00.

MacLaren, A. The God of the Amen, and other Sermons. London: Alexander, 1891. Pp. 348, p. 8vo, 5s.

McNeill, John, Rev. Sermons. Vol. III. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 408, 8vo, \$1.50.

March, Daniel M., D.D. Morning Light in many Lands, Boston: Cong. S. S. & Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. ii., 116, 8vo, cloth, \$2.00. (Gives results of a tour of mission fields.)

Martineau, James. Essays, Reviews, and Addresses. Selected and revised by the author. Vol. III. Theological and Philosophical. Vol. IV. Academic, Religious. London: Longman, 1891. Pp. 562, 596, p. 8vo, each, 7s. 6d.

Meyer, F. B., Rev. Abraham: or, The Obedience of Faith. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 305, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00. (Also) Elijah, and the Secret of his Power. The same. Pp. 224, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00. (Also) Israel, a Prince with God. The same. Pp. 180, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00. (Also) Joseph: Beloved, Hated, Exalted. The same. Pp. 190, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Mitchell, J. Murray, M.A., LL.D. (ed.). Once Blind, now Christian. The early life of Baba Padmanje. An autobiography. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. x., 135, 12mo, 75 cts.

Molsdorf, Wilhelm. Die Idee des Schönen in der Weltgestaltung bei Thomas von Aquino. Dissertation. Leipzig: Fock, 1891. Pp. 47, 8vo, 80 pf.

Moore, Aubrey, L., M.A. The Message of the Gospel. Addresses to candidates for ordination, and sermons preached chiefly before the University of Oxford. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. viii., 153, 8vo, 75 cts.

Mosen, P. Hieronymus Emser, der Vorkämpfer Roms gegen die Reformation. Inaugural-Dissertation. Halle a. S.: 1890. Pp. 78, 8vo.

Murray, J. Clark, LL.D. An Introduction to Ethics. Boston: De Wolf, 1891. Pp. vi., 357, 18m.o.

National Temperance Convention. Proceedings of the Tenth National Temperance Convention held at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., July 15 and 16, 1891; containing the papers presented, speeches delivered, resolutions and reports adopted, roll of delegates, etc. New York: Nat. Temp. Soc., 1891. Pp. ii., 215, 8vo, paper, 25 cts.

Naville, Th. Les sacrifices lévitiques et l'expiation. Courte esquisse. Lausanne: Bridel, 1891. Pp. 150, 8vo, 2 fr.

Netter, N. Die Geschichte Noah's und die Sündflut. Eine Uebersetzung und kritische Behandlung des Midrasch Rabbah: nebst Anhang. Inaugural-Dissertation. Strassburg, 1891. Pp. ii., 132, 8vo.

Nevin, John Williamson, D.D., LL.D. College Chapel Sermons. Edited by Henry M. Keiffer, D.D., and compiled from the Editor's Notes taken at the time of their delivery. With an introduction by W. M. Reilly, Ph.D. Philadelphia: Ref. Ch. Pub. Ho., 1891. Pp. 231, 12mo, \$1.25.

Page, Jesse. David Brainerd, the Apostle to the North American Indians. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 160, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts. (Missionary Biographies, No. 3.)

Paludan-Müller, J. Guds Rige og evangeliske Tro. Kjøbenhavn, 1891. Pp. 208, 8vo, 3 75 mk.

Pitra, J. B. Analecta Sacra. Spicilegium Solesmense. Vol. VII. Paris, 1891. 8vo, 15 fr.

Ratte, Franz. Der Redemptorist Karl Clemens (1816-1880). Ein noch unbekanntes Convertitenbild. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1891. Pp. vii., 123, 8vo, 1 50 mk.

Renan, Ernest. History of the People of Israel from the Time of Ezekiah till the Return from Babylon. Boston: Roberts, 1891. Pp. x., 429, 12mo, cloth, \$2.50.

Ricardon, A. De humane mentis aternitate apud Spinozam. Paris: Alcan, 1891. Pp. 92, 8vo.

Robertson, J. M. Modern Humanists. Sociological Studies of Carlyle, Mill, Emerson, Arnold, Ruskin, and Spencer. London, 1891. Pp. 270, 8vo, 3s.

Roberty, E. de. La Philosophie du siècle. Criticisme, Positivisme, Evolutionisme. Paris, 1891. Pp. viii., 235, 8vo, 5 fr.

Roland's nachmals Papstes Alexander III., Sentenzen. Zum ersten Male herausgegeben von Ambrosius M. Gietl. O. Pr. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1891. Pp. lxx., 332, 8vo, 9 mk.

Rose, Stewart. St. Ignatius Loyola and the Early Jesuits. New York: Cath. Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. xv., 432, 8vo, \$6.00.

Rossi, St. John Baptist de, Life of —: from the Italian by Lady Herbert: introduction on ecclesiastical training and the sacerdotalism by the Bishop of Salford. Baltimore: Murphy, 1891. Pp. iv., 311, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

Rydborg, Viktor. Teutonic Mythology. Authorized translation from the Swedish, by Rasmus B. Anderson. London: Sonnenschein, 1891. Pp. 702, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

St. Clair, G. rre. Buried Cities and Bible Countries. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. x., 378, 8vo, \$2.00.

St. Jure, J. B. Christ our Teacher. From the French: with introduction by James Cardinal Gibbons. Baltimore: McCauley, 1891. Pp. 424, 24mo, cloth, 60 cts.

Sausseye, P. D. C. de la. Manual of the Science of Religion. Translated from the German by Beatrice S. Colyer-Fergusson. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 670, 12s. 6d.

Sayce, A. H., Rev. The Races of the Old Testament. London: Rel. Tr. Soc., 1891. P. 8vo, 5s.

Schaefer, E. Die Bedeutung des lebendigen Christus für die Rechtfertigung nach Paulus. Dissertation. Gütersloh, 1891. Pp. 90, 8vo.

Schmid, Franc., Prof., Dr. Quaestiones selectae ex theologia dogmatica. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1891. Pp. vi., 433, 8vo, 8 mk.

Schmidt, Wilhelm, Dr. Der alte Glaube und die Wahrheit des Christenthums. Berlin: Wiegandt, 1891. Pp. iii., 374, 8vo, 6 mk.

Schneider (Köstrin), O. Transcendental psychologie. Leipzig: Fock, 1891. Pp. iv., 467, 8vo, 10 mk.

Schürer, Emil, D.D., M.A. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. Being a revised edition of a "Manual of History of New Testament Times." First Division. Political History of Palestine from B.C. 155 to A.D. 135. Translated by the Rev. John Macpherson, M.A. 2 vols. Second Division. The Internal Condition of Palestine and of the Jewish People, in the Time of Jesus Christ. Translated by Sophia Taylor and the Rev. Peter Christie. 3 vols. Index, translated by the Rev. John Macpherson. M.A. (Edinburgh: Clark; New York: Scribners, 1885-91. Pp. viii., 467; viii., 407; xii., 379; viii., 327; viii., 387; xiv., 339, 8vo, \$8.00.

Schultze, Th., Dr. Das Christenthum Christi und die Religion der Liebe. Ein Votum in Sachen der Zukunftsreligion. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1891. Pp. 80, 8vo, 1 50 mk.

Secretan, G. Les Premières Missions évangéliques en pays païens. Paris, 1891. Pp. 71, 8vo.

Siegfried, Carl, und Stade, Bernard, Prof., Drs. Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Mit 2 Anhängen, I. Lexikon zu den aramäischen Stücken des Alten Testaments. II. Deutsch-hebräisches Wörterverzeichnis. 1. Abtheilung. Leipzig: Veit, 1892 (1891). Pp. 420, 8vo, 15 mk.

Silberstein, M., Dr. Einleitende Ideen zur Geschichte der Juden und des Judenthums. Vortrag. Wiesbaden: Limbarth, 1891. Pp. 14, 8vo, 60 pf.

Simcox, W. H. The Cessation of Prophecy, and other Sermons. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 330, p. 8vo, 6s.

**Staerk, W.** Untersuchungen über die Komposition und Abfassungszeit von Zach. 9 bis 14 mit eingehender Berücksichtigung der neuesten Hypothese. Inaugural-Dissertation. Halle a. S.; 1891. Pp. 102, 8vo. \$1.50.

**Steenstra, P. H., Rev., D.D.** The Being of God as Unity and Trinity. New York: Houghton, 1891. Pp. vi., 269, 12mo, \$1.50.

**Stokes, G. T., D.D.** The Acts of the Apostles. New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. xx., 424, 8vo, \$1.50. (Expositor's Bible.)

**Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica.** Essays chiefly in Biblical and Patristic Criticism. (See Mag. for Aug., 1891.) New York: Macmillan, 1891. \$4.00.

**Tarniquet, G., Abbé.** Le Premier Français martyrisé au Japon, ou Vie de vénérable Guillaume Courtet, religieux dominicain. Lille: Desclée, 1891. Pp. 215, 8vo.

**Thouvenot, E.** Vie de Jean Chrysostome. Toulouse: Lagarde, 1891. Pp. 219, 12mo, 1.40 fr.

**Tomkins, H. G.** The Life and Times of Joseph in the Light of Egyptian Lore. London: Rel. Tr. Soc., 1891. P. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

**Tuttle, James H., D.D.** The Field and the Fruit. A memorial of twenty-five years' ministry with the Church of the Redeemer, Minneapolis. Boston: Univ. Pub. Ho., 1891. Pp. ii., 362, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

**Upham, Francis W., LL.D.** Saint Matthew's Witness to Words and Works of our Lord: or, Our Saviour's Life as Revealed in the Gospel of his Earliest Evangelist. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1891. Pp. vi., 415, 12mo, \$1.30.

**Weinstein, N. I.** Geschichtliche Entwicklung des Gebotes der Nächstenliebe innerhalb des Judenthums. Kritisch beleuchtet. Berlin: Rosenstein, 1891. Pp. 48, 8vo, 1.25 mk.

**Willems, C.** La saint robe de N. S. Jésus Christ à Trèves. Étude archéologique et historique. Traduite par F. Raynaud. Trier: Paulusdruckerei, 1891. Pp. 353, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

**Worms, René, LL.D.** Eléments de philosophie scientifique et de philosophie morale, rédigés conformément aux programmes de mathématiques élémentaires. Paris: Hachette, 1891. Pp. vi., 115, 12mo, 1.50 fr.

**Wyclif, Johannis.** Tractatus de blasphemis. Now first edited from the Vienna MS. 4514, with critical and historical notes by M. H. Dziewicki. Lond.: Trübner (for Wyclif Soc.), 1891. Pp. xi., 295, 8vo. (Also: De Eucharistia tractatus major. Accedit tractatus de eucharistia et penitentia sive de Confessione. Now first edited from the manuscripts with critical and historical notes by Johann Loserth. (English side-notes by F. D. Matthew.) The same. 1892 (1891). Pp. lxii., 359, 8vo.

**Zisterer, A., Dr.** Gregor X. und Rudolf von Habsburg in ihren beiderseitigen Beziehungen. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Frage über die grundsätzliche Stellung von Sacerdotium und Imperium in jener Zeit, nebst einigen Beiträgen zur Verfassungsgeschichte des Reiches. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1891. Pp. vii., 170, 8vo, 3 mk.

#### CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 20th of each month.)

Sept. 15. German-Presbyterian convention at Nyack, N. Y.

Sept. 16. The one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Reformed Dutch Church at Fishkill, N. Y., celebrated.

Sept. 21-24. National conference of Unitarian and other Christian churches, Saratoga, N. Y.

Sept. 22-24. German Catholic convention at Buffalo, N. Y.

Sept. 25. Rev. Howard MacQuary renounced the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Sept. 25 his deposition was pronounced at Trinity Cathedral, Cleveland, O. He has accepted a call to the First Universalist Church of Saginaw, Mich.

Sept. 27. Rev. A. P. Bissell, Ph.D., D.D., accepts the professorship of Hebrew, Biddle University, Charlotte, N. C.

Oct. 5. The charges and specifications of the indictment for heresy against the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., Edward Robin-

son Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York City, presented in the Presbytery of New York at the regular fall meeting. The citation was placed in Dr. Briggs' hands Oct. 6, and the answer to it was set down for Wednesday, Nov. 4.

Oct. 6-8. Semi-annual convention of the fifth conference of the Ex-Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and adjacent States at Augustaville, Pa.

Oct. 7-21. Ecumenical Methodist conference, Washington, D. C. (see programme in last number).

Oct. 10. The one hundred and fourth anniversary of the Moravian Society for Propagating the Gospel, at Bethlehem, Pa.

Oct. 13-16. Eighty-second annual meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions at Pittsfield, Mass. Opening sermon by Rev. Dr. E. B. Webb, of Boston, Mass.

Oct. 14. Consecration of Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D., as Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Massachusetts, in Trinity Church, Boston, Mass. Sermon by Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of New York.

Oct. 15. Twenty-third convention of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America, Buffalo, N. Y.

Oct. 20-22. Forty-fifth annual meeting of the American Missionary Association at Cleveland, O. Opening sermon by Rev. Albert J. Lyman, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

#### OBITUARY.

Caldwell, Rt. Rev. Robert, D.D., LL.D. (Church of England), assistant bishop to the Bishop of Madras, from 1877 till shortly before his death, at Madras, July 28, 1891, aged 77. He went out to Madras in 1838. He was the author of a "Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages," a "History of the Tinnevely Mission," and other works.

Burchard, Rev. Samuel Dickinson, D.D. (Presbyterian), died at Saratoga, N. Y., Sept. 25, 1891, aged 80. He was a pastor in New York from 1839 to 1865.

Hodge, Rev. Caspar Wistar, D.D., LL.D. (Presbyterian), Professor of New Testament exegesis in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., since 1869; died there, Sept. 27, 1891, aged 61.

Boone, Rt. Rev. William Jones, D.D. (Episcopalian Bishop of Shanghai), died at Shanghai, China, Oct. 5, 1891, aged 45. He was born at Shanghai, returned there as missionary in 1869, and was consecrated a bishop in 1884.

#### CALENDAR.

Oct. 21. Meeting of the Universalist General Convention at Worcester, Mass.

Oct. 24. Enthronement of the Bishop-elect of Lichfield (the Hon. and Rev. Augustus Legge), at Lichfield, Eng.

Oct. 24. Thirteenth quadrennial General Conference of Wesleyan Methodists at Grand Rapids, Mich.

Oct. 28. Consecration of Rev. J. L. Nicholson, D.D., as Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Milwaukee, at St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Oct. 28-29. Annual meeting of the Unitarian Sunday-School Society, at Fitchburg, Mass.

Nov. 11. Meeting of the General Missionary Committee of the M. E. Church, at Cleveland, O.

Nov. 17. Fourteenth meeting of the Protestant Episcopal Church Congress, at Washington, D. C.

Nov. 17-19. Meeting of the Baptist Missionary Union, at Buffalo, N. Y.



01.

en-  
ew  
in  
wn

nce  
ent

ou,

he  
m,

an  
ld,  
m,

ns  
ty  
r,

of  
o,

an  
y

g-  
ill  
le  
n-  
y

d  
or

y,  
i-  
y,

p  
s,  
y,

t

e

s

s

s

## Important Notice to Magazine Subscribers.

*The Concise Dictionary Gazetteer* (see p. 7 Advertisements), will be sent post-paid on receipt of seventy-five cents to those who have taken the first twenty-four numbers of *The Magazine of Christian Literature*, in which the Dictionary appeared complete. It will be furnished in pliable covers so that it may be slipped under the cover of the bound volume, or in loose sheets for binding, as desired. The sale of the Gazetteer in separate form is limited strictly to magazine subscribers as above.

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE CO.